



U.S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

AGRICULTURAL
ECONOMIC
REPORT NO. 307

THE ROLE OF MULTICOUNTY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS IN RURAL AREAS. By Gerald Doeksen, O. W. Holmes, John Kuehn, Leon Perkinson, and Stan Voelker. Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture. Agricultural Economic Report No. 307.

ABSTRACT

Multicounty development districts or planning organizations contribute to rural development by providing services and expertise usually available to large cities but beyond the financial and technical/professional resources of small towns and rural areas. Ten organizations in Missouri, North Carolina, North Dakota, Oklahoma, Oregon, and South Dakota were studied to determine their structure, funding, functions, and services performed. Their responsibilities fall mainly into three categories--planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance. Membership in all but one unit, which was formed for a specific purpose, covered 4-10 counties each.

An increasingly important function of these organizations is providing clearinghouse services related to applications for Federal cost-share funds for planning and development. Such a procedure allows State, regional, and local agencies to study the proposals and raise questions or objections. In this way, duplicating, conflicting, or overlapping projects can be eliminated or changed as needed.

Keywords: Planning, Development, Multicounty districts, Technical assistance, Funds, Local organizations, Cost sharing.

CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
HIGHLIGHTS.....	iv
INTRODUCTION.....	1
Study Objectives.....	1
Methodology.....	2
Types of Organizations.....	2
Comprehensive Planning Organizations.....	2
Resource Conservation and Development Project.....	10
CASE STUDIES.....	11
Missouri.....	11
Meramec Regional Planning Commission.....	11
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission.....	14
North Carolina.....	18
Neuse River Council of Governments.....	18
Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission.....	21
North Dakota.....	25
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development.....	26
Oklahoma.....	30
Eastern Oklahoma Development District.....	31
Northern Oklahoma Development Association.....	35
Oregon.....	38
East Central Oregon Association of Counties.....	39
Upper Willamette Conservation and Development Project.....	41
South Dakota.....	44
First Planning and Development District.....	44
GLOSSARY OF ORGANIZATIONS.....	51

HIGHLIGHTS

Multicounty development districts or planning organizations can play an important role in the development of nonmetropolitan areas, as shown by a study of 10 such entities in 6 States.

About 100 Federal programs provide cost-share funds for development projects. Each has its own guidelines and administrative procedures that applicants must follow. Large metropolitan areas usually have funds, staff, and professional resources to enable them to identify and participate in these programs. Nonmetropolitan areas generally lack these resources, and hence they may fail to get their fair share of Federal funding. Regional planning districts can assist rural communities by identifying federally funded programs, and assist them in the preparation of their applications for funding.

Policymakers and planners need to know what organizations are active in their areas, and the limitations and scope of these entities, if they are to take full advantage of the services offered. This study provides some insight into the various types of organizations, and their functions and services.

The main functions of these regional organizations are planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance. None of the regional organizations included in this study can tax, adopt land use regulations, enact zoning regulations, or incur bonded indebtedness. Operating funds usually come from Federal, State, and local sources.

Clearinghouse procedures are required by the Office of Management and Budget, Executive Office of the President, before Federal agencies may authorize funds for various development programs. Project proposals must clear through State, regional, and local agencies in order to aid in the coordination of Federal or federally assisted projects and programs with State, areawide, and local planning for orderly growth development. The clearinghouse procedure attempts to avoid duplication of effort, permit other agencies to raise questions or objectives, and assure that maximum benefits are realized from expenditure of public funds.

Nine of the entities studied are recognized as official State regional planning organizations; eight have clearinghouse responsibilities; seven have been designated by the U.S. Economic Development Administration as Economic Development Districts. Only two, organized specifically for Federal Resource Conservation and Development projects, are concerned with soil and water conservation. One of these has State recognition as a regional planning organization. The other does not.

All 10 organizations provide some information and assistance to nonmember agencies as time and expertise permit.

THE ROLE OF MULTICOUNTY DEVELOPMENT DISTRICTS IN RURAL AREAS

by

Gerald A. Doeksen, O. W. Holmes, John Kuehn,
Leon Perkinson, and Stan Voelker 1/

INTRODUCTION

Large cities and counties in metropolitan areas have long employed professional staffs for comprehensive planning and for drafting zoning ordinances, building codes, subdivision regulations, and other tools needed to make their plans effective. Professionals employed by these governments have been able to keep abreast of the guidelines and the Federal programs that provide grants-in-aid to local governments for comprehensive planning and economic development. Nonmetropolitan governments generally lack the professional expertise needed to monitor Federal programs and prepare applications for Federal grants. As a consequence, metropolitan areas have received the lion's share of funds designated for programs in metropolitan and nonmetropolitan areas.

Study Objectives

Regional or multicounty organizations are becoming more numerous throughout the country. These can be a means of coordinating Federal grants for planning and economic development, and provide a convenient geographical framework for administering State services and functions. In order to formulate and implement rural development programs, policymakers need to know what organizations are active in rural planning and development. Furthermore, they need to know the structure, expertise, and functions of these organizations.

Between 1965 and 1971, there was an expansion of Federal grants to assist State and local governments. Each Federal program has its own guidelines and administrative procedures. Some programs require that counties or municipalities combine to form realistic areas for determining project priorities and

1/ Agricultural Economists, Economic Development Division, Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture.

program funding. As a result, a number of different multicounty organizations with overlapping geographical boundaries were organized in various States to carry out activities funded at least in part by the Federal Government.

The Executive Office of the President, realizing the need to coordinate boundaries of these many programs, issued a series of memoranda to encourage State governors to designate a single set of multicounty districts. 2/ Most governors followed these suggestions.

The primary emphasis in this study was on comprehensive planning organizations operating within boundaries designated by the respective governors. These organizations operate under various names, including regional planning commissions, councils of governments, regional planning and development districts, and lead regional organizations.

Methodology

Case studies were conducted in two stages. First, members of a study group from the Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture (ERS, USDA) contacted State and local agencies to determine what multicounty organizations had been formed. Secondly, two multicounty organizations each in Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, and Oregon, and one each in North Dakota and South Dakota, were selected for case studies. One Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) project was included. 3/ The principal function of an RC&D council is to prepare and carry out multicounty plans for resource conservation, use, and development. The fact that the Oregon's RC&D's activities are limited largely to planning soil and water conservation projects puts it in a class by itself. The case study selections provided a wide geographical distribution and a balance between the various types of organizations. A member of the study team visited each selected organization in late 1973 to obtain detailed information.

Types of Organizations

Comprehensive Planning Organizations

The nine comprehensive planning organizations covered in this study are "umbrellas," under which planning is carried out for a variety of purposes, generally with at least some Federal funding (table 1). Seven have been designated by the U.S. Department of Commerce's Economic Development Administration (EDA) as Economic Development Districts (EDD); the other two

2/ The earliest of these memoranda was U.S. Budget Circular No. A-80, Jan. 31, 1967. The present wording appears in Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95, Part IV, Revised Nov. 13, 1973, which superseded A-80.

3/ A Resource Conservation and Development Project is a locally initiated and sponsored activity whose purpose is to improve the economy of an area through development of its natural resources. The RC&D program is administered by the Soil Conservation Service of the U.S. Dept. of Agriculture. It was a provision of the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-703).

Table 1--Classification of the regional planning organizations studied

Type, name of organization, and State	Recognized by the State as the official regional planning organization	A-95 review <u>1</u>	Economic Development District	Comprehensive health planning region	Law enforcement assistance council or committee	Planning soil and water conservation projects of public benefit
<u>Comprehensive Planning:</u>						
Meramec Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	Yes	Yes	<u>2</u> /No	Yes	<u>3</u> /No	No
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>4</u> /No	Yes	No
Neuse River Council of Governments, N.C.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Albermarle Regional Planning and Development Commission, N.C.	Yes	Yes	Yes	<u>4</u> /No	<u>3</u> /No	No
Eastern Oklahoma Development District, Okla.	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
Northern Oklahoma Development Association, Okla.	Yes	Yes	<u>2</u> /No	<u>4</u> /No	Yes	No
East Central Oregon Association of Counties, Oreg.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
First Planning and Development District, S. Dak.	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes	No
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development, N. Dak.	Yes	No	<u>5</u> /Yes	No	Yes	Yes
<u>Resource Conservation and Development Project:</u>						
Upper Willamette RC&D, Oreg.	No	No	No	No	No	Yes

1/ Office of Management and Budget Circular A-95 requires that applications for Federal assistance in some 100 programs be submitted to the designated clearinghouse for review and comment.

2/ Have applied to EDA for EDD status.

3/ Separate agency but cooperates closely.

4/ Organization's staff carries out regional health-related activities.

5/ Provisional.

have applied for this status. Three have been designated as regional comprehensive health-planning organizations, and seven have been funded by the Federal Law Enforcement Assistance Administration (LEAA), through State law enforcement councils, to develop the basic plans needed to appraise local grant applications for law enforcement facilities and cooperative programs.

Table 2 gives general information relating to the nine comprehensive planning organizations. The number of counties in each organization ranges from 4 to 10. The 1970 population in the nine areas ranged from about 58,000 to over 400,000 inhabitants. The organizations studied began functioning as early as December 1966 and as recently as October 1971. Membership in the organizations is voluntary, and generally includes counties and municipalities (table 2). In some cases, soil conservation districts and special districts may join. In one case, private groups may join. In no case in the organizations studied, however, may private individuals join.

Of the organizations studied, none have authority to tax, adopt land use regulations, enact zoning ordinances, or incur bonded indebtedness. They are primarily planning and coordinating entities.

Governing Board, Funding, and Staffing--The governing board of the sample organizations ranges from 12 to 66 voting members (table 3). These members are generally local officials or are appointed by local government units. The number of member governments also varies greatly, even within the same State. Three organizations have nonvoting members, who are frequently State legislators, representatives of State planning offices, or representatives of interested corporations. Terms of office for board members range from 1 year to as long as the member holds elected office in his respective organization. Board members generally can succeed themselves. Five of the nine governing boards meet monthly, two meet quarterly, one meets twice a quarter, and the other meets whenever necessary (about four times a year). All but one governing board have members from minority groups. Six boards have designated executive committees ranging in size from 6 to 19 members. In four organizations, the executive committee meets between regular governing board meetings.

Board members do not receive compensation from the comprehensive planning organizations. However, some receive travel expenses from the local government they represent.

Funding for these organizations comes from Federal, State, and local sources (table 4). The latest budgets of the nine organizations ranged from about \$80,000 to over \$300,000 in fiscal year 1973 (FY-73). By far the largest share of each organization's funding came from Federal sources. Funds from State sources ranged from 0 to \$20,000. Five organizations did not receive State funds. Funds from local sources ranged from \$5,524 to \$57,700, mostly from local membership assessments.

The size of the professional staff ranges from 4 to 12 members (table 5). Of the 63 professionals in the organizations, 26 (41 percent) have advanced degrees. The educational background of the professionals is diverse. Twelve (19 percent) have degrees in the field of planning. The education and administration (business and public) fields follow closely, with 10 and 9

Table 2--General characteristics and membership in comprehensive planning organizations

Organization and State	:	:	:	:	Membership includes---				
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	Counties:	1970 population:	Date staffed	Counties:	Municipalities:	Private individuals:	School districts:	Other special districts:	
	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:	:
	- -	<u>Number</u>	- -						
Meramec Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	6	89,581	April 1971	Yes	Yes	<u>1</u> /No	<u>2</u> /Yes	<u>2</u> /Yes	
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	7	87,378	Dec. 1966	Yes	Yes	<u>3</u> /No	No	No	
Neuse River Council of Governments, N.C.	9	410,123	Sept. 1968	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission, N.C.	10	97,302	July 1971	Yes	Yes	No	No	No	
Eastern Oklahoma Development District, Okla.	7	191,228	1967	Yes	Yes	No	No	<u>4</u> /Yes	
Northern Oklahoma Development Association, Okla.	8	161,187	Oct. 1971	Yes	Yes	No	No	<u>4</u> /Yes	
East Central Oregon Association of Counties, Oreg.	4	58,233	Aug. 1971	<u>5</u> /Yes	No	No	No	No	
First Planning and Development District, S. Dak.	10	98,600	July 1971	<u>6</u> /Yes	<u>6</u> /No	No	<u>6</u> /No	<u>6</u> /No	
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development, N. Dak.	10	104,216	Feb. 1971	Yes	Yes	No	No	<u>4</u> /Yes	

1/ Private groups may join as nonvoting members.

2/ Nonvoting members.

3/ Private groups may join, as voting members; however, private individuals may not.

4/ Soil Conservation District.

5/ Membership is limited to county intergovernmental councils.

6/ Policy is that if county is a member, all local governmental units within county are entitled to receive the services of the organization.

Table 3--General information concerning governing boards of comprehensive planning organizations

Organization and State	Voting members	Nonvoting members	Term of office	May succeed themselves	Frequency of meetings	Members on: executive: committee:	Frequency of execu- tive board meetings
	- - <u>Number</u> - -		<u>Years</u>			<u>Number</u>	
Meramec Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	28	11	2	Yes	Monthly	None	
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	34	6	<u>1/</u>	<u>1/</u>	<u>2/</u>	6	<u>3/</u>
Neuse River Council of Governments, N.C.	40	3	<u>4/</u>	<u>4/</u>	Twice/quarter	18	Quarterly
Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission, N.C.	58	0	<u>5/</u>	Yes	Quarterly	19	Monthly <u>1/</u>
Eastern Oklahoma Development District, Okla.	21	0	3	Yes	Monthly	7	Meets with gov. board
Northern Oklahoma Development Association, Okla.	26	0	3	Yes	Monthly	8	Meets with gov. board
East Central Oregon Association of Counties, Oreg.	12	0	1	Yes	Monthly	None	
First Planning and Development District, S. Dak.	66	0	1	Yes	Monthly	None	
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development, N. Dak.	31	0	2	Yes	Quarterly	11	Monthly <u>6/</u>

1/ Members are elected officials and serve as long as they hold office.

2/ Board meets whenever necessary, about 4 times a year.

3/ Committee meets whenever necessary, about 5 times a year.

4/ Members are appointed by local governments and serve at the pleasure of the body they represent.

5/ Board members serve staggered terms. County members serve terms of 1, 2, 3, or 4 years. Municipal members serve terms of 1 or 2 years.

6/ Executive committee meets with full board for their meeting, and by itself the months the governing board does not meet.

Table 4--Funding of comprehensive planning organizations for Fiscal Year 1973

Organization and State	Funding				Source of Federal funds <u>1/</u>
	Federal	State	Local	Total	
	----- <u>Dollars</u> -----				
Meramec Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	67,000	0	34,500	101,500	HUD, EPA, Office of Civil Defense
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	112,625	0	12,450	125,075	EDA, HUD, LEAA, EEA, Ozarks Regional Commission
Neuse River Council of Governments, N.C.	145,408	0	57,700	203,108	EDA, HUD, LEAA, EEA
Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission, N.C.	98,791	1,250	22,200	122,241	EDA, HUD, EEA, HEW
7 Eastern Oklahoma Development District, Okla.	212,855	20,913	36,977	270,745	HUD, EDA, HEW, LEAA, EEA
Northern Oklahoma Development Association, Okla.	46,220	20,644	15,000	81,864	HUD, LEAA
East Central Oregon Association of Counties, Oreg.	49,500	5,000	5,524	60,024	EDA, HUD, LEAA
First Planning and Development District, S. Dak.	261,896	0	40,000	301,896	HEW, FmHA, EPA, EDA, HUD, LEAA
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development, N. Dak.	8,670	0	10,000	<u>2/</u> 245,177	HUD

1/ HUD--Department of Housing and Urban Development; EPA--Environmental Protection Agency; EDA--Economic Development Administration; LEAA--Law Enforcement Assistance Administration; EEA--Emergency Employment Act (Department of Labor); HEW--Department of Health, Education and Welfare; and FmHA--Farmers Home Administration.

2/ In addition to the Federal and local money, the Soil Conservation Service obligated a total of \$226,507 for the Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development.

Table 5--Professional and support staff of comprehensive planning organizations

Organization and State	Professionals									Support staff				
	Total	With advanced degree	Have training in--							Total	Secretar- ial or clerical	Book- keeper	Other	
			Geography and planning	Eco- nomics	Adminis- tration	Engineer- ing	Account- ing	Educa- tion	Other					
Number														
Meramec Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	6	2	2				2	1	1		4	3		1
South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission, Mo.	<u>1/11</u>	1	2			2			1		6	3	3	
Neuse River Council of Governments, N.C.	7	1	3				1		1	2	4	3	1	
Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission, N.C.	<u>2/7</u>	2	1			1			2		3	5	2	1 2
Eastern Oklahoma Development District, Okla.	12	8			2	3	1			4	2			
Northern Oklahoma Development Association, Okla.	4	2			1	1			2		3	1	1	1
East Central Oregon Association of Counties, Oreg.	4		1							3	2	1		1
First Planning and Development District, S. Dak.	12	7	3		2	2	1		1	3	6	3	1	2
Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development, N. Dak.	<u>2/6</u>	3	1							4	1	1		
Total	63	26	12		5	9	5		4	10	18	28	16	5 7

1/ Includes five health personnel under contract with the Missouri Division of Health.

2/ Includes three VISTA (a U.S. agency--Volunteers in Service to America) volunteers.

professionals, respectively. Support staff per organization range from 1-6. They are mostly secretaries, clerical workers, and bookkeepers.

The primary functions of the comprehensive planning organizations can be classified by three categories: (1) planning, (2) clearinghouse responsibilities, and (3) technical assistance. Some organizations are also asked to establish operating programs; that is a quasi-implementation function.

The comprehensive planning organizations are charged with planning activities within the district. In general, each organization updates its comprehensive district plan each year, based on the previous year's accomplishments and updated goals. Because parts of the comprehensive plan are completed separately, many organizations have individual plans for land use, solid waste, water and sewer, housing, aging, health, law enforcement, and other activities. Also, many of the organizations completed plans for specific communities in 1973.

Eight of the nine comprehensive planning organizations studied have been designated as regional clearinghouses. ^{4/} Office of Management and Budget (OMB) Circular A-95 requires that applications for Federal assistance in some 100 programs be submitted to the designated clearinghouse for review and comment. Some of the regional organizations in this study handle over 100 applications annually.

Clearinghouse responsibility, as specified in Circular A-95, is carried out under the Project Notification and Review System (PNRS). This system was designed to provide Federal agency cooperation with State and local governments in coordinating and reviewing proposed projects under selected grant programs through State, regional, and local clearinghouses. Under the PNRS system, the applicant submits a project notification form which precedes the preparation of the application. It is submitted at the earliest feasible date in order to allow maximum time for effective coordination and to avoid delay in the submission of the application.

Except in States that have adopted A-95 procedures which require a single notification, the applicant must notify both the State and the regional (non-metropolitan or metropolitan) clearinghouse of the intent to apply for Federal assistance. If the project involves an area that extends into the jurisdictional area of more than one clearinghouse or State, notification must be sent to each clearinghouse involved. The State clearinghouse and the regional clearinghouse have 30 days after receipt of the notification to inform other States and regional and local agencies and, if necessary, to arrange to consult with the project applicant.

After the designated time expires or a response is obtained from the clearinghouses, the applicant prepares the application forms. The clearinghouse may work with the applicant to resolve any problems raised by the proposed project during the 30-day period and while the application is being completed. If necessary, the clearinghouse may have an additional 30 days to

^{4/} The Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development has been designated by the State as the regional planning organization, but has not been charged with A-95 clearinghouse review responsibilities.

review the application and transmit to the applicant any comments or recommendations which are to accompany the application when submitted to the Federal agency. Some projects require environmental impact statements with the application.

In general, substate planning organizations provide technical assistance to local governments as far as time and expertise permit. The assistance can be categorized into three groups. (1) The organizations provide assistance in completing the appropriate forms and informing government units where financial assistance is available. (2) The organizations often hold seminars on important issues to provide local leaders with critical information. For example, several organizations have held seminars on revenue sharing. (3) The final category varies greatly, depending on available expertise. If an organization can help a member government with a particular local problem, for example by providing an engineer or planner, it will make that assistance available. Some organizations have assisted in planning, budgeting, and organizing countywide solid-waste disposal systems.

Resource Conservation and Development Project

The RC&D organization included in this study was the Upper Willamette Resource and Conservation and Development Project in Oregon. This project involves four counties and about one-third of a million people. Participation in this RC&D is open to all local governments, including counties, municipalities, school districts, and other special districts. Members are not required to pay dues, but they are asked to contribute toward the office expenses incurred by the RC&D.

The governing board of the Upper Willamette RC&D is comprised of 12 members. They represent the sponsors, and each member may serve any number of terms. Public Law 87-703 and the Secretary of Agriculture's Memorandum No. 1665 defined RC&D projects and assigned Soil Conservation Service (SCS) leadership. Requests for RC&D funding for project measures are submitted to the State Conservationist for approval. The Upper Willamette RC&D council has leadership for carrying out the project plan through the local units of government that it represents and through public and private agencies and organizations.

CASE STUDIES

Missouri

In Missouri, four major types of multicounty organizations are directly responsible for one or more programs affecting rural development: (1) Regional Planning Commissions (RPC); (2) Economic Development Districts (EDD); (3) Resource Conservation and Development (RC&D) projects; and (4) Community Action Agencies (CAA). ^{5/} The RPC's are probably the most significant spatially, legally, and functionally. The State is delineated into 20 RPC's, and each had a staff working on district planning in 1974.

Five EDD's have been designated by the EDA and four other districts had applied for designation by late 1973. In all cases, the EDD's and respective RPC's have identical boundaries, organization, and staffing. By late 1973, two RC&D projects had been authorized for operation and one RC&D project was authorized for planning. The first two are not spatially coterminous with the RPC's; the third is spatially coterminous and is staffed by the RPC. The 18 multicounty CAA's in Missouri cover the entire State. All are separate and independent from the RPC's.

The Meramec Regional Planning Commission and the South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission were selected for detailed study.

Meramec Regional Planning Commission

The Meramec RPC consists of six counties in east-central Missouri: Crawford, Dent, Gasconade, Maries, Phelps, and Washington. The 1970 population of 89,581 included 26,872 urban and 62,709 rural residents. The Meramec RPC was officially designated by the Governor on January 23, 1969, under Missouri Revised Statutes 251.150 to 251.440; an office was established in Rolla, Mo., and a staff was acquired in April 1971.

Besides being an RPC, Meramec is by its membership requirements also a Council of Governments (COG). At the time of this study, the region was awaiting designation by the EDA as an EDD. Meramec RPC is also the designated Comprehensive Health Planning Region, with a Regional Health Council advising the RPC's commission.

The Meramec RPC engages in four functions; namely, planning, clearing-house responsibilities, technical service, and research. Their primary

^{5/} For the delineation of RPC's, EDD's, and RC&D's, see Status of Multicounty Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., July 1973.

emphasis is on planning.

Planning--Planning activities have included determination of goals and objectives, local city planning, parts of a comprehensive plan, and citizen involvement. On April 6, 1971, following three public meetings with citizens of the region, the commission adopted a resolution of goals and objectives for the comprehensive programs. These goals and objectives emphasized enhancement of social, cultural, and aesthetic values; improvements in land use; economic development; and adequate housing. In the more recent Overall Economic Development Plan (OEDP), the commission specified locations where growth is expected to occur. These selected places are not necessarily where growth should occur for maximum regional impact but, rather, where growth is predicted. Regional plans will consider these growth locations. Implementation of these plans rests with the individual commission members representing local government units. About a third of a comprehensive regional plan had been completed when this study was underway. Technical advisory groups, which include regional citizens, assist the commission and its staff in preparing the plan. All commission meetings are open to the public, at which time individual citizens can comment on the region's programs.

The staff completed five plans in FY-73. No consultants were hired. Three local comprehensive and capital improvements plans requested by three towns are now being implemented. Some 1,650 man-hours were spent on each plan. Two of the towns provided \$1,500 each for the plans from their own budgets. The third town, for which a HUD "701" grant was not obtained, paid the full costs of \$6,000 from its own budget. The staff also completed the first phase of a regional solid-waste disposal plan which was mandated by State law. About 5,000 man-hours were involved in completing this plan, which two counties are now implementing. One county operates its own landfill and the other has contracted with a private vendor. The fifth plan was the OEDP plan required for designation by EDA. Plans completed prior to FY-73 were a regional water and sewer system plan and a plan for a small municipality.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--The Meramec RPC has A-95 review authority at the regional level. The A-95 review process in Missouri was a dual operation in 1973. A local government unit or agency submits one review directly to the State Department of Community Affairs for comment by State agencies, and one review to the RPC for comment at the regional level. During the regional A-95 review, Meramec RPC contacts many agencies such as school districts, SCS, and Farmers Home Administration (FmHA).

During FY-73, Meramec RPC reviewed 22 projects, involving a total of \$11,785,000. Six were for State highway projects, three for expansion of State parks, two for expansion of Clark National Forest, two for the Law Enforcement Assistance Council's (LEAC's) plan and action program, one for SCS activities, and eight for hospital expansions. Several additional A-95 reviews were requested by municipalities for water and sewer projects and for open-space acquisitions. Only one project, for expansion of Clark National Forest, received unfavorable comments. It was not recommended because of the further reduction of one county's tax base, and fear of deterioration of the county's roads from truck transportation. About one-third of the other projects were modified during the initial A-95 review. Meramec RPC's A-95 process also

includes evaluation of environmental impact statements. ^{6/} The staff prepared three such impact statements for municipal projects in FY-73.

The A-95 review process can be time consuming. For example, the A-95 review requested by the U.S. Army's Corps of Engineers for their environmental impact statements on the Meramec Park Reservoir had been in process for 8 months when this study was underway, and was expected to take up to another year. Upon notification, the RPC advertised that the impact statement was available and that written public comments would be accepted for 60 days. The commission also held a public meeting on the issue. A consolidated report was then returned to the Corps of Engineers. The Corps has since made additional requests to the RPC.

Not all A-95 reviews require that much time. For example, a State highway department project for realignment of 2 miles of roadway required only about 45 days for review. After notification, the staff contacted the concerned commissioners for their opinions on traffic flow, checked municipal comprehensive plans, and requested additional information from the State agency on its long-range highway program. Overall regional traffic patterns were also studied. The RPC also published in the news media that the highway project would be discussed at its next regular meeting, to which the public was invited, as was customary. After final comments were made, the review was forwarded to the State Department of Community Affairs and a copy was returned to the State Highway Department.

Technical Assistance--During FY-73, the staff of Meramec RPC provided many technical services to its member governments in its day-to-day operations. No fees were received for these general services. Many requests were answered concerning completion of revenue-sharing forms, explanations of new legislation, and completion of grant forms. The RPC's fiscal officer assisted two small communities in the preparation of their yearly budgets. The engineering administrator prepared preliminary design plans and cost estimates for sewer systems for 18 towns. About 55 requests were received concerning the designs and costs of recreational facilities such as tennis courts, parks, and picnic benches. Besides services to member governments, the Meramec RPC also collected data for other agencies. These included the State Highway Department, State Division of Commerce and Industrial Development, and U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation. These nonmember clients were charged a fee by the RPC.

Most of the requests for technical services can be answered relatively quickly. For example, one town requested information on the size and specifications for tennis courts. After consulting various planning guides, the staff prepared sketches and cost estimates. Within a week, the mayor received his answer.

A few requests for technical assistance require lengthy and practically continuous effort. In July 1972, one county requested assistance in developing a solid-waste disposal system that would satisfy State requirements and be economically feasible. After considering alternative disposal methods and cost calculations prepared by the engineer, the RPC's staff determined that a

^{6/} Environmental impact statements are required by the National Environmental Protection Act for many federally financed projects.

countywide landfill would be the least expensive system. An informational and public relations program was conducted in the county. The RPC staff attended about 30 meetings with mayors, the county court, and the public. By 1974 a nonprofit landfill board had been incorporated and it has selected a site for the landfill. The sytem will probably be operational within a year.

Research--The Meramec RPC staff conducts research and is seeking funds to finance additional projects. Three projects had been completed by late 1973. One planning and geology project studied the subsurface water supply surrounding the Meramec Park Reservoir, and recommended land utilization. A mental health study was completed for the Disabilities Council and an inventory of law enforcement facilities was furnished to the LEAC. Studies concerning recreation and housing are being carried out as a basis for the regional comprehensive plan. The RPC staff is also interested in doing or receiving research results on four different topics: (1) organization and spatial size of special districts such as ambulance, fire, and sewer; (2) alternative funding sources for substate planning districts on a permanent, legal basis; (3) alternatives and scale economies in solid-waste disposal; and (4) a farm land-use study, with emphasis on the management of grape vineyards.

South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission

South Central Ozark Regional Planning Commission (SCORPC), located along the south-central border of Missouri, encompasses seven counties: Douglas, Howell, Oregon, Ozark, Shannon, Texas, and Wright. In 1970, 87,378 persons lived in the district's 6,111-square-mile area. SCORPC began informal operations in December 1966 with an office at West Plains. It was officially designated a substate planning district in February 1967, under Missouri's State and Regional Planning and Community Development Act.

SCORPC also forms the boundaries and base for three other major organizations. In June 1968, the commission was designated an EDD, and a 51-member advisory board was appointed. Board members represent county courts, mayors, minority groups, business, medicine, public safety, and industry. The commission was designated an LEAA in 1971. A committee was organized within the structure of SCORPC to serve as the Law Enforcement Assistance Council. Another organization related to SCORPC is the nonprofit Ozarks Development Corporation, which is also the commission's industrial development committee. This corporation is composed of representatives from local industrial development groups, including 8 municipalities, 4 banks, and more than 2,500 individual stockholders.

SCORPC plans, conducts action programs, carries out A-95 reviews, and provides technical assistance and research. Planning and the execution of action programs are emphasized. An important part of day-to-day operations is to inform local governments of the availability of Federal funds for various projects. To date, the commission has employed only one consulting firm, which produced an architectural scale model of the 1,000-acre Planned Progress Park for industrial and other uses. (The park is further discussed under Research and Action Programs.)

Planning--Over 135 citizens served on various committees that drafted a set of regional goals and objectives, published in May 1972. Considerable input was, and still is, obtained from citizens at large. The primary goal for the region is "the creation of new job opportunities that would preclude the continued outmigration of the younger people and provide a better income for those who choose to remain and live, work, play, and raise a family in a predominantly rural environment where space is an asset for a better life" (SCORPC, A Report to the People, 1972). Besides stabilizing agricultural employment and fostering tourism, the primary means of development being pursued by the staff for achieving this goal is to provide additional manufacturing jobs within the region. Other goals and objectives include additional medical facilities, sheltered workshops, restriction of eminent domain power, and implementation of planned solid-waste disposal systems. The region's citizens drafted the original goals and objectives and also determine any amendments thereto.

While encouraging growth in all cities in the region, the commission has selected a primary center and five secondary centers for employment growth. The commission chose these six locations in order to obtain the greatest regional impact from their growth strategy. Planning and promotion of new and/or expanded manufacturing development are being utilized to support these centers.

The commission and its staff are working on a regional comprehensive plan. Much of the planning work has emphasized either municipal comprehensive plans or regionwide specific plans. All of the plans were or are being prepared by the staff without compensation from any local government. The staff completed five municipal sketch plans in FY-73. These are simplified, comprehensive plans, providing zoning ordinances and subdivision regulations for small communities for the next 5 years. Six other communities had prepared comprehensive or sketch plans which are being implemented by municipal planning commissions. Also during FY-73, the staff completed a solid-waste disposal plan for two counties and seven cities. This activity included drafting uniform ordinances and handling contract bids. A centrally located landfill is now in operation. Other work included updating the Overall Economic Development Plan for EDA and preparing a solid-waste plan, a recreation and parks plan now being implemented, a water and sewer phase II plan for FmHA, and a law enforcement phase II plan for LEAC. Plans completed in previous years included a master plan for the Ozarks Development Corporation's Planned Progress Park, a regional land-use inventory, and the Overall Economic Development Plan.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--SCORPC is the designated regional clearinghouse for A-95 review. The process at the time of this study was the same throughout Missouri and was discussed in the Meramec RPC section.

In 1972, SCORPC reviewed 15 projects totaling \$6,046,331 in Federal, State, and local funds. These projects included three statewide programs for the State Highway Department, State Department of Labor, and State Health Division. Other projects were the region's law enforcement and economic development programs, five local water and/or sewer projects, two public swimming pools, a hospital expansion, an airport, and a community action agency's program request.

Program funds were requested from FmHA, EDA, Ozarks Regional Commission, U.S. Department of the Interior's Bureau of Outdoor Recreation (BOR), EPA, OEO, and Federal Aviation Administration (FAA).

In the first 9 months of 1973, SCORPC carried out A-95 reviews on 26 projects totaling over \$18 million in combined Federal-State-local funds. Federal funds were from OEO, FmHA, EPA, Law Enforcement Program, HUD, HEW, Department of Transportation (DOT), USDA's Forest Service, Ozarks Regional Commission, Water Resources Council (WRC), EDA, and SCS. Nine of these reviews were for statewide programs of the State Division of Health, HUD "701" funds, State Highway Department, State law enforcement program, State Water Resources Board, State Air Conservation Commission, State Office of Aging, the Missouri Jaycees, and the Missouri Bar Association. A-95 reviews in FY-73 included two for SCORPC's law enforcement and economic development programs, three for the Central Ozarks community action agency, two for Clark National Forest, four for Rural Electrification Administration (REA) cooperatives, two for public water supply districts, and four for municipal projects.

Most of the projects reviewed were forwarded with favorable or no comment after possible modification and arbitration during the initial clearinghouse procedures. Two projects were forwarded with unfavorable or constructive comments. The first was a law enforcement project that SCORPC felt included ambiguous legislative relations. The second was the State Office of Aging project, which was not organized in conformity with substate planning districts' boundaries.

A-95 reviews are quite variable in their demands on the regional staff. For example, the local community action agency notified SCORPC on December 22, 1972, of a project requesting funds to give food preparation demonstrations for low-income aides. On December 29, SCORPC notified other agencies, including University of Missouri extension centers. On January 11, 1973, the extension centers responded that they had similar programs. The next day, SCORPC notified the State clearinghouse to "interrupt and hold" their review process. On January 24, SCORPC conducted a joint meeting with the community action agency and the extension centers, at which time SCORPC requested an agreement of understanding between the two agencies involved and also requested sanitary inspection of the food preparation facilities. An agreement was received on February 12 and the request was approved by the State clearinghouse on February 19.

On the other hand, some A-95 reviews are completed more rapidly. For example, a public water supply district notified SCORPC on January 24, 1973, that it intended to extend its mains. After checking with the district highway engineer and its own water and sewer plans, SCORPC approved the project on February 19 and also drafted an environmental impact statement.

Technical Assistance--On request, SCORPC's staff furnishes technical and consulting services to member governments without charge. Such assistance includes the preparation of environmental impact statements; explanations of legislation; the organization of public water supply districts, soil conservation districts, and public housing authorities; information on sanitary sewer systems; representation before State legislative committees; assistance on municipal budgeting; drafting of uniform ordinances; maintenance of a statis-

tical library; and formation of a speakers' bureau for public and civic meetings. The staff also assisted in the development of a community health clinic, furnished plans for an emergency shelter for small municipalities, handled bids for vendors in the solid waste disposal plan, and helped organize a Community Betterment Corporation. About 60 days were required to provide architectural plans and cost estimates for the combination picnic pavilion and underground emergency shelter. The staff also assisted in preparing bond issues and conducting fund-raising campaigns for industrial parks and hospitals.

The preparation of applications for Federal and State programs is probably the major technical assistance requested by members. Development projects totaling over \$7 million had been completed at the time of this study, and projects in process totaled another \$4.5 million. Such projects include water and sewer systems, vocational-technical schools, airports, hospitals, and city parks.

Research and Action Programs--The SCORPC staff also conducts research in support of its other functions. For example, a request for additional medical personnel required background information and economic justification. An initial housing survey also was completed. In mid-1973 the staff was investigating the feasibility of employing circulating city managers to standardize accounting systems, purchasing activities, and capital improvement programs for groups of four or five cities. The commission needs assistance for two research projects. The first concerns the restoration of orchards and vineyards--within the region and the formation of marketing cooperatives for the produce. The second concerns the feasibility of raising rough fish in sewage lagoons for pet food ingredients.

The chief action program of SCORPC is the creation of additional jobs in new or expanded manufacturing establishments. Technical assistance and grantsmanship for local governments to obtain social and economic overhead capital are important and continuing functions of this action program. The staff estimates that over 1,500 new manufacturing jobs and over 500 attendant service positions were created within the region from mid-1969 to 1974.

The major action program is the Planned Progress Park, a centrally located, 1,000-acre industrial park owned by the Ozarks Development Corporation. The commission's staff serves as consultant, planner, and developer for this project. "Designed primarily as a site for new and expanding industry, the park will also contain such job-producing regional facilities as an airport, educational institutions, a detention and rehabilitation center, experimental agricultural plots, government office buildings, and such private commercial enterprises as motels, restaurants, service stations, and clubs" (SCORPC, A Report to the People, 1972). Costs of developing the industrial park are phased to the projected income derived from new job opportunities. Thirteen different agencies or programs are involved in this project.

Another major action program is the provision of health facilities and personnel. The contract with the Missouri Division of Health provides the services of five health personnel and a secretary for regionwide public health programs. SCORPC also is submitting another application to the National Health Service Corps for the assignment of more physicians in the region. SCORPC has also been active in expansion of one community hospital and the pending construction of a new tricounty hospital.

Another activity is the implementation of the law enforcement plan with the acquisition of base stations, mobile units, other communication equipment, and drug identification kits.

North Carolina

In North Carolina, 17 official substate districts were established by Executive Order of the Governor in 1970. The designated organization in each district is called the Lead Regional Organization (LRO). ^{7/} Of the 17 LRO's, 11 are Councils of Government (COG's) and 6 are Regional Planning Agencies (RPA's).

RPA's are authorized to convert to COG status by the simple process of passing a resolution stating they are changing their method of operations from one enabling legislation act to another. A COG can do anything the member governments can do except that it has no eminent domain authority and it cannot levy taxes.

Four districts in eastern North Carolina have been designated and funded as Economic Development Districts (EDD's). Three EDD's are coterminous with the LRO's. There are four Resource Conservation and Development Projects (RC&D) in the State. Two were operational in mid-1974; the other two were in the active planning stage. Those in operation are autonomous from, but co-operate with, the LRO's. In general, RC&D boundaries are not coterminous with LRO's.

Two LRO's were selected for more detailed discussion of the responsibilities and activities of multicounty organizations in North Carolina--the Neuse River Council of Governments and the Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission.

Neuse River Council of Governments

The Neuse River COG contains nine counties in the south-central coastal plains: Carteret, Greene, Onslow, Craven, Jones, Pamlico, Duplin, Lenoir, and Wayne. Population of the nine counties was 410,123 in 1970. Initial planning efforts began in May 1967 and an office was established at New Bern in September 1968. Health planning and criminal justice planning are conducted by the COG staff. However, separate policy boards for health and for criminal justice are set up to advise the staff. The Neuse River COG has also been designated an EDD, and all EDA functions are carried out by the COG staff.

The Neuse Area Development Association is a volunteer group sponsored by USDA. The Association has the same geographic boundaries as the COG, but a different board and staff.

^{7/} For boundaries of LRO's, EDD's, and RC&D's, see Status of Multicounty Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., Jan., 1974.

There are nine USDA county Rural Development Committees in the Neuse River district, but no regional committees. USDA's Extension Service and other USDA agencies are located in the region, but generally speaking, these are not organized along boundaries coterminous with the COG.

The primary functions of the COG are planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance.

Planning--Five plans were prepared by the COG in FY-73. These plans and the man-months required to complete them were: population and economic study, 6 months; housing study, 3 months; water quality management, 6 months; overall program design update, 2 1/2 months. These plans are required by HUD. They are basic documents on which to build, and they present the basic data for later plans.

The fifth plan is a criminal justice plan, which took about 6 months to complete. It is used to identify the problems and needs for criminal justice agencies on a regional basis. It is also used to determine priorities between and within functional categories.

Before the COG was organized, goals were established by a series of citizen participation meetings. It is now the policy to have the COG board, mainly elected officials, establish goals. In addition, advisory committees have been initiated to provide inputs. The board and committees develop a new set of goals and priorities each year, depending on past accomplishments and present needs. A land use plan establishes policy on where growth should occur.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--The COG has A-95 clearinghouse responsibility. During FY-73, about 58 A-95 projects were handled and 20 environmental impact statements were reviewed. About 60 percent of the A-95 review projects were water and/or sewer requests. Low-income projects, funded by OEO, were the next largest group.

The COG reviewed 14 projects in June and July of 1973. The amount of money involved was \$2,124,343 from grants, \$161,000 from loans, and \$187,894 in kind. Projects included three water system projects, one senior citizens project, one airport project, one solid waste project, one project dealing with poverty, and seven projects related to police services and housing. Federal funds came from FmHA, HEW, FAA, OEO, EPA, and LEAA.

Most of the disapprovals came from the State. The plans are routed through a large number of agencies, which have a breadth of expertise that COG lacks. Three projects were reportedly turned down by the State. Two were small commercial airports that wanted to expand into regional airports. The State is preparing a plan to assist in the designation of regional airports, so these requests were denied. Another project was a dam.

A water project for New Bern and an airport project for Wallace are used below to illustrate the clearinghouse procedure for this COG.

The city of New Bern applied for assistance to expand its water supply. It filled out a form listing the beneficiaries, source of funds, and a narrative description of the project. It provided a letter from its engineers stating what was needed and why. This information was sent to the Craven County Committee Chairman and to the county planner. They examined the document to make sure the project did not conflict with anything the county planned. A response was expected within 15 days.

The forms were sent to the COG and the State office for A-95 clearance. Both agencies had 30 days in which to make a decision. The State and COG approved the project within 30 days, and the application was sent to FmHA for action.

The city of Wallace applied for a grant to improve the runway for the Wallace Municipal Airport. A description of the project, an environmental impact statement, and a map were sent to the State office and to the COG. The agencies were asked to respond in 30 days. The COG sent the material to the Duplin County Commissioners Coordinator. A neighboring COG was notified of the project. This COG indicated it had doubts about the project. A meeting, set up between the two COG's to discuss the problem, was attended by representatives from the State Board of Health, North Carolina Department of Transportation, U.S. Corps of Engineers, State Department of Natural and Economic Resources, and the two regions involved. The project was discussed and an agreement was reached. The Corps of Engineers agreed to straighten the channel past the airport and the original improvements were slightly altered. The COG and State then approved the project, and the plan was sent to FAA for funding. The necessity of a face-to-face meeting is considered to be relatively rare in the region.

Technical Assistance--The Neuse River COG provides many types of technical assistance, though not in a specific "project" sense. Some examples include: (1) organizing drug information groups, (2) developing an extensive library on criminal justice, (3) providing training money for police departments, and (4) developing a regional information system. Assistance with problems is sought as needed.

Criminal justice worked with consultants who could provide the needed expertise on jails. For a communications system, the State has a consultant firm that works on regional committee plans and makes recommendations. The consultant also writes the specifications, prepares the bid procedures and requirements, and submits coordinations of broadcast frequencies. Beyond this, contact is on an "as needed" basis.

The watershed planning staff leader with SCS maintains contact with SCS, State Office of Water and Air, U.S. Geological Survey, Corps of Engineers, State Highway Department, U.S. Bureau of Commercial and Sport Fisheries, local governments, and their offices such as county health, tax records, building codes, and ordinances. Again, the help is apparently sought on an "as needed" basis without any systematic involvement of outside agencies. Another important function of COG is to inform local government leaders of sources of Federal grants.

Albemarle Regional Planning and Development Commission

The Albemarle Regional Planning and Development District (RPC) encompasses 10 counties in the northeastern coastal plains of North Carolina: Camden, Chowan, Currituck, Dare, Gates, Hyde, Pasquotank, Perquimans, Tyrell, and Washington. These counties had a total population of 97,302 in 1970. The RPC was officially funded in March 1971, and a director was hired in July 1971. An office was established in Edenton.

The Albemarle RPC is also designated as an EDD. One staff carries out the RPC and EDD activities. The Comprehensive Health Planning Region has the same designated boundaries, but it has its own board. The RPC staff carries out the responsibilities.

Regional LEAA activities are carried out by a separate staff located in another city in the region. The two offices cooperate to assure there is no duplication of effort. The LEAA program was set up several years before the RPC was organized. Another organization, OEO's Community Action Program, has the same geographic boundaries but a separate staff. Again, this organization predates the RPC by several years.

The Albemarle Area Development Association is a volunteer organization dating from about 1960; it is still very active. It is sponsored by USDA's Extension Service. The RPC considers itself an outgrowth of the Development Association and its working arm. The RPC Board meets 1 1/2 hours prior to the association meeting. They join the association for dinner and attend its meetings. The association and the RPC have the same committees. This system provides local input into the RPC plans.

The Development Association has a separate policy board but many members serve on the RPC board as well. The RPC's secretary also acts as a secretary to the association. When the association develops an idea, it is handed to the RPC for implementation. Some local officials believe that almost everything that has occurred regionally has been an outgrowth of the association.

The Albemarle Human Resources Development System encompasses the same counties as the RPC. It was an outgrowth of the RPC and Comprehensive Health Planning District. It has an autonomous policy board made up of health practitioners and those with a direct interest in health, such as school superintendents and hospital administrators. This system was developed from the needs as seen by the RPC, as some mechanism was needed to follow up on plans. Perhaps its strongest suit is that it is not identified with any particular group. It does, however, work strictly with regional programs.

An RC&D application was ready in 1973 for submission to USDA when funding again becomes available for that program. The application for assistance was drafted with the cooperation of the RPC, which is one of the sponsors. When assistance is authorized, the plan will be prepared to be consistent with policies and goals of the RPC.

There are county rural development panels in the region, and the RPC staff attends as many of these as they can.

Planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance are the primary functions of this RPC.

Planning--The Albemarle RPC completed five plans in FY-73:

- (1) Overall Economic Development Plan. The RPC is updating the Overall Economic Development Plan (OEDP). It is expected to take about 6 man-months and is not required by any agency. The OEDP contains most of the information that will be used in other plans; without it, the other plans would require more preparation time.
- (2) HUD "701" Plan. This is prepared annually to determine what has been accomplished and to lay out next year's work. The plan is required by HUD. Preparation time is about 2 man-months.
- (3) Comprehensive Health Plan. The plan is updated yearly and serves as a plan of work. Preparation time is about 1 man-month.
- (4) Aging Plan. The plan is updated yearly to review the accomplishments and serve as a plan of work. It is required by the Governor's Council on Aging and takes about 1 month to prepare.
- (5) Manpower Plan. This plan is also updated yearly and is used as a plan of work. It is required by HEW and the U.S. Department of Labor's Manpower Council. Preparation time is about 2 man-months.

The Albemarle RPC has a policy on growth consisting mainly of a land use plan, implemented at the county level. Goals are determined by need. Inputs are received from the Area Development Association, rural development panels, and autonomous boards. In some instances, the RPC holds public hearings.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--The Albemarle RPC has A-95 clearance responsibilities. A list of projects from September 1972 through December 1972 appears below.

Two projects were disapproved; neither had a request for money. One was the Chesapeake, Virginia, Intake Discharge System. It was disapproved, at the State and regional levels, because it altered the water source. The second project disapproved had to do with restricted air space for the military. This particular air space is already the most restricted in the United States; further restrictions would limit public access to the outer coastal banks. The RPC held public hearings and the proposal was dropped after the hearings. The project was never officially submitted. It was disapproved by FAA and in principal, at least, by the RPC.

Two projects illustrate the clearinghouse role for the RPC. The Washington County Water Department applied for a grant to improve the county's water system. The RPC received the application from the State. Also included with the form was basic information about the project, and a map. The RPC sent the information to the Washington County Commissioners, mayors of the two concerned municipalities, and the county health department. All responses favored the project. The RPC sent a letter to the State clearinghouse approving the project and indicating the relationship between the project and the regional plan.

<u>Project</u>	<u>Local gov.¹</u>	<u>Funds²</u> <u>\$1,000</u>	<u>Source³</u>
Urban renewal	M	373	F&S
Neighborhood facility	Co.	120	F
Regional library	Co.	150	F&S
Water system	M	3	S
Watershed	Co.	1,276	F
Water system	Co.	9,200	F&S
House restoration	Co.	30	F&S
Waterfront project	M	27	F
House restoration	Co.	75	F&S
Beautification	Co.	45	F
Water plan	Co.	10	S
Memorial house	M	782	Private
Water plan	Co.	6	S
Airport	M	352	F&S
LEAA projects:			
Summer police (2)	M	5	S
Jails (3)	M, Co.	22	S
Ordinances (2)	M	7	S
Sheltered home	Co.	9	S
Project analyst	Regl.	12	S
Training	Regl.	4	S
Training	M	4	S
Planning	Regl.	4	S
Patrol car	Co.	3	S

¹M--municipal, Co.--county, Regl.--regional.

²Includes only requested funds. Does not include local funds.

³F--Federal, S--State.

The second example consisted of an application by Chesapeake, Va., for an intake and pump station located within the region. The RPC received the application form, an environmental impact statement, and other information from the State. The RPC in turn sent the information to elected officials in the county, the county health director, the extension agent, and SCS. These individuals and agencies responded with questions. The RPC then corresponded with the State office, requesting answers or information on eight points. The State informed the RPC that the project was disapproved at the State level and further action was not necessary.

Technical Assistance--Twenty-eight major technical assistance projects were mentioned. The range of projects was almost as broad as the activities of the RPC. The primary activities, in decreasing order of frequency, seemed to be assistance in developing requests for funds; acting as an intermediary to bring together agencies with services to offer and those needing services; and analysis of specific areas for possible new employers in conjunction with the State, and similar studies. Eight projects related to water and/or sewer

systems, seven to business or industry, and five to physical projects such as a regional library, local airport, ambulance service, and two community centers. Among the others were historical homes preservation and city beautification. Background work was done for the possible location of a retirement home, but the sponsors decided to go elsewhere.

Local governments asking for assistance were divided about equally between counties and municipalities. At least six requests appeared to be from private sources.

The Ocracoke Water System and the Stumpy Point Community Center illustrate technical assistance provided through RPC.

Ocracoke is a remote island community, on the Outer Banks, about 3 hours' traveltime from the county seat. Local officials lacked expertise and sought help for their problem--unpalatable water from cisterns, the only source of water.

EDA was contacted for funding assistance. EDA specified what needed to be done. It requested an economic impact study for such items as jobs created, a land use plan, and an agreement with the National Park Service, whose jurisdiction extends over much of the island, to maintain the land used for 20 years.

The land use plan was contracted out. Basically, however, the RPC did the background work. Ocracoke went to FmHA for funds.

The RPC staff accompanied the Ocracoke community leaders to the regional EDA office in Huntington, W. Va., for the preapplication conference. The RPC also assisted the community in finding a list from which they could choose a consulting engineer to design the physical system. The project was approved by EDA.

The RPC also provided technical assistance for the Stumpy Point Community Center. The community had already raised most of the money at that point. To minimize community outlays, the School of Design at North Carolina State University was asked to take on the architectural work as a class project, and they agreed. This did cause a problem with HUD because plans must carry an architect's seal. The class was finally able to secure such a seal. Soil testings for load-bearing capacities of the soil were done by SCS at no charge.

Because HUD also required a guarantee of structural maintenance for 20 years, the community had to put \$500 for each year in escrow in the county's name to assure maintenance. In addition, to indicate that the community center would be a multipurpose unit, the community needed the commitment of public health, mental health, regional library system, agriculture extension, and others that they would use the building. The community advertised for bids and did not get a single response. In late 1973 the community was scaling down the building size to fit the resources available.

North Dakota

There are two types of multicounty planning organizations in North Dakota: Council of Governments (COG), and Regional Planning Councils (RPC). The COG is an interstate organization, consisting of Clay County, the city of Moorhead, and the village of Dilworth in Minnesota; and Cass County and the cities of Fargo and West Fargo in North Dakota.

The history of the North Dakota RPC's differs considerably from that of similar organizations in other States. The Governor's Executive Order of September 18, 1969, grouped North Dakota's 53 counties into eight regions for planning and administration of State programs and services. Multicounty planning organizations were formed in seven of these regions prior to 1973 and steps were taken in 1974 to organize an RPC in the other region, but it was not actually operating prior to 1975. ^{8/} The governing board and policymaking body of each RPC is the Executive Council, composed of county commissioners, city mayors, and soil conservation district supervisors.

The original purpose of these seven RPC's was to develop applications for assistance to USDA for RC&D projects, with boundaries coterminous with the State planning regions. Two of these applications have been approved by USDA for RC&D planning and operations and another has been approved for planning assistance. The other four RPC's are still seeking RC&D planning assistance from USDA.

All seven of the RCP's have assumed responsibility for functions other than planning RC&D projects. During 1972 and 1973, six of them employed professional planners for general regional planning, financed largely by HUD "701" nonmetropolitan planning grants through the North Dakota State Planning Divisions. Four RPC's have been granted provisional designation as Economic Development Districts (EDD's) by EDA and two of these have received planning assistance grants from EDA. Five RPC's have been named the multicounty policymaking bodies for the Human Resource Planners in their respective regions, financed by OEO. Six employ Law Enforcement Planners, financed by LEAA grants and administered by the North Dakota Law Enforcement Council.

The RC&D project committees have evolved into multicounty planning organizations, primarily because of encouragement from State agencies and "pass-through" financial grants from HUD, OEO, LEAA, and EDA. In order to reflect this change in basic purpose and function, all but one of the RPC's dropped the term "Resource Conservation and Development" from their official names in 1974. To most local people, however, they are still known as "RC&D's."

^{8/} For boundaries of the COG and the eight planning regions, see Status of Multicounty Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, and Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., June 1973.

The Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development was selected by the ERS Study group for indepth analysis of a multicounty planning organization.

Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development

This RPC has assumed various planning responsibilities for State Planning Region VII, which consists of 10 counties in south-central North Dakota: Burleigh, Emmons, Grant, Kidder, McLean, Mercer, Morton, Oliver, Sheridan, and Sioux. The population of the region totaled 104,216 in 1970, composed of 44 percent urban, 30 percent rural nonfarm, and 26 percent rural farm.

In the fall of 1967, the county commissioners and soil conservation district supervisors from the five counties west of the Missouri River organized the Lewis and Clark 1805 RC&D Project. The project was authorized by USDA for planning in January 1970 and was authorized for operations in February 1971. The five counties east of the Missouri River were annexed to the project in February 1972, which made the project boundaries coterminous with the State planning region boundaries. Shortly after that, the Constitution and Bylaws were changed to make the Executive Council of the RC&D project eligible to receive HUD "701" nonmetropolitan planning grants, and it soon became the recognized agency for comprehensive planning in State Planning Region VII. It receives Federal planning grants from OEO and LEAA, as well as from HUD, and it has been designated as the waste-water planning agency in this region for EPA programs. In January 1973, EDA gave this region a provisional designation as an EDD. The Council was incorporated as a nonprofit corporation, Lewis and Clark 1805 Resource Conservation Planning and Development Council, in January 1973. The legal name was changed to Lewis and Clark 1805 Regional Council for Development in July 1974.

The governing board and policymaking body of Lewis and Clark 1805 is the Executive Council, consisting of one county commissioner, one city mayor, and one soil conservation district supervisor from each of the 10 counties.

The Nodak South Central Comprehensive Health Planning Council operates within the same regional boundaries as the RCP, but with a different policymaking body and with a separate staff.

Region VII contains parts of two Indian reservations: (1) a small part of the Fort Berthold Reservation, and (2) a large part of the Standing Rock Reservation.

RPC and its staff have contacted many State and Federal agencies for assistance in solving local and regional problems. State agencies frequently contacted include the Department of Business and Industrial Development, Game and Fish Department, Highway Department, Historical Society, Law Enforcement Council, Outdoor Recreation Agency, Planning Division, Water Commission, and various specialists in the North Dakota Cooperative Extension Service and the Agricultural Experiment Station.

Federal agencies contacted for technical and financial assistance include ARS, FmHA, and SCS in USDA; EDA; HUD; OEO; and Bureau of Sports Fisheries and Wildlife, Survey, and Bureau of Reclamation in the Interior Department.

On a few occasions, the RPC officers or staff have called in architects and other private consultants. Local people complain that some of these consultants try to talk sponsors into project designs that are too elaborate and expensive for available finances.

The RPC staff is primarily involved in performing planning duties and providing technical assistance. The RPC is not currently designated as the regional A-95 clearinghouse, although the State Planning Division, which serves as the clearinghouse for projects affecting this region, makes a practice of sending all Federal plans and grant proposals to the RPC for review and comment. In addition, the RPC staff assists in preparing required environmental impact statements for any project proposal developed by one of its member governments.

Planning--During FY-73, the Lewis and Clark 1805 staff worked on a regional plan required for EDA funding, a comprehensive regional plan, and many specific project plans for flood control and critical area treatment under its RC&D authority. The staff spent about 90 man-days on the EDA plan, and additional time will be required for revisions needed to meet EDA standards. The RPC is attempting to develop a plan for the entire region that will meet the requirements of all Federal agencies. This work absorbed a major share of staff time from November 1972 through December 1973. The specific projects for which plans were prepared are discussed in a later section on technical assistance.

The initial RC&D project sponsors established goals on the basis of their collective aims and priorities, and these goals in turn influenced the types of projects that were included in the original regional plan. Very likely, the early objectives of soil and water conservation, resource development, and erosion prevention will influence policies and programs advocated by the RPC for a long time to come.

The RPC and its planning staff have assumed that the twin cities of Bismarck and Mandan will continue to be the principal growth center for the entire region. Available evidence indicates that this growth--industrial, commercial, and residential--will occur in a 6-mile belt surrounding these cities.

Since early 1972, the RPC and its staff have become increasingly concerned about the impending expansion of lignite strip mining in this region, for both gasification and thermal generation of electricity to relieve energy shortages in the Midwest. Strip-mining companies have acquired huge blocks of coal leases, power companies have obtained sites for generating plants and rights-of-way for high voltage lines under threat of condemnation, and gas companies have applied to the State for rights to huge quantities of water needed for gasification of lignite. Acute conflicts over use of land and water are already developing, particularly in McLean, Mercer, and Oliver counties, where the coal seams are thickest. Population trends in these counties very likely will change from heavy net outmigration to fairly heavy net immigration. County governments, cities, and school districts will be faced with sudden increases in demand for services without concomitant increases in tax revenues. And over all hangs a dark pall of fear for the appearance of the countryside when the mining companies get through with it, if adequate steps for spoilbank reclamation are not taken now.

In late 1972, the RPC Executive Council was planning to formulate new regional goals after thorough review of the information being compiled by the planning staff. This part of the planning process very likely will involve the County Resource Planning and Development Committees (CRPDC's), which have provided an effective means for obtaining inputs from citizens outside the governing body.

The general relationships between RPC and the CRPDC's are given in the bylaws. Each member of the RPC Executive Council serves on one of five subject-matter committees of the RPC: Land and Water; Agriculture and Forestry; Recreation, Tourism, and Wildlife; Industry and Transportation; and Human Resources and Community. Each subject-matter committee consists of two Executive Council members and two members from each of the 10 CRPDC's. Each county committee consists of the three representatives of that county on the RPC Executive Council, plus other local people appointed jointly by the county commissioners, mayors, and soil conservation district supervisors. The bylaws suggest that these appointments include representatives of water management boards, park boards, historical societies, county improvement associations, and tribal councils, as well as private citizens.

This county-region organizational structure was established primarily to consider action proposals under the RC&D project. It involves many local people, attending many meetings, and of course, it requires a lot of time. Nevertheless, one reason for the RPC's success apparently is the broad consensus achieved locally by the direct involvement of many local people.

Technical Assistance--Service to members and other local governments has been the most important function of the Lewis and Clark 1805 Council. These services have been of several distinct types: (1) Assistance in planning local projects; (2) supplying technical advice or assistance to local projects; (3) design, installation, and financial assistance under the RC&D program for control of soil erosion in critical areas; (4) acting as a catalyst or liaison agent to bring various Federal, State, and local officials together to cooperate on a local project; and (5) assisting local agencies in preparing applications for Federal and State grants.

Two local projects assisted by the RPC are: The Garrison Heritage Park and Recreation Area project, which is fairly typical of the many local park projects assisted by the RPC; and the Fish Creek Recreation Area project, which illustrates the RPC's effective coordination of the efforts of several government agencies on a specific local project.

(1) Garrison Heritage Park and Recreation Area. Early in 1973, Garrison residents submitted an action proposal for a historical park to the McLean CRPDC, which endorsed the proposal to the RPC Executive Council. The proposal was approved by the RPC Recreation, Tourism, and Wildlife Committee. It was given a high priority, which authorized the RPC staff to assist in planning the project.

The Garrison people early learned that the most likely source of outside financial assistance was the U.S. Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, which makes matching grants through the State Outdoor Recreation Agency. If the Garrison

Park Board was one of the sponsors, the chances of getting a BOR grant would be improved.

Discussion between members of the Garrison Heritage Foundation and the Park Board resulted in general agreement on a combination historical park and recreation area. A 1 1/2-acre site, two blocks from Main Street and reasonably accessible to the senior citizens' club, was chosen. The Heritage Park was planned to include restoration of a railroad depot, a one-room school house, and a small country church, and eventually a historical museum. The planned recreation facilities were aimed toward senior citizens, but not exclusively--horseshoe and shuffleboard courts, and facilities for croquet and lawn bowling. A lavatory building was included as well.

The RPC staff prepared a series of six optional plans for the historical park and six for the recreation area, which were presented to the local people. A pair of options, with some adjustments, was returned to the RPC staff for detailed plans. Separate plans were prepared for landscaping and construction, and combined into an overall development plan, which was returned to the local people for approval.

Meanwhile, an appraisal was obtained on the proposed site, the RPC staff started drafting the application for BOR funding, and the SCS District Conservationist began to assemble construction cost estimates.

Some difficulty had been anticipated with the placement of historical buildings on land funded for recreational purposes and further revisions in the plans were necessary. After approval by local sponsors the revised plan became the basis for cost estimates, and negotiations for the land were started.

The RC&D Project Coordinator helped the local group devise a plan of action for carrying the project proposal into the funding stage. At long last, a joint meeting of the Heritage Foundation, Garrison Park Board, and State Outdoor Recreation Agency (which processes applications for BOR funding) was held to make the final agreements to prepare an application for BOR funding. Because most of the land had been donated, the final package provided that the Park Board would not have to pay any of the acquisition and construction costs and the Heritage Foundation would pay only a relatively small sum--assuming a 50-50 BOR grant is made.

(2) Fish Creek Recreation Area. The New Salem Sportsmen's Club made a proposal to the Morton County Resource Planning and Development Committee for development of the Fish Creek Recreation Area because of the lack of sport fishing waters in this general vicinity. The State Game and Fish Department was called in to appraise the potential for sport fisheries. It reported favorably and SCS was asked to make a topographic survey, design the dam, and prepare the estimates. The Morton County Water Management Board agreed to underwrite the cost of drilling and soil tests needed for project design.

At this point, a joint meeting of the several interested agencies was held to determine whether to proceed with the project. This group included the State Game and Fish Department, State Water Commission, Morton County Park Board, Morton County Water Management District, Morton County Commissioners,

State Outdoor Recreation Agency, and SCS. They agreed that the project was desirable and feasible, and each agency agreed to make the following contributions to the project:

State Game and Fish Department	Land acquisition and a portion of construction costs.
State Water Commission	A portion of construction and operating costs.
Morton County Park Board	A portion of construction costs.
Morton County Commissioners	Construction and graveling of access roads to the lake.
Morton County Water Management District.	A fixed amount of money.
State Outdoor Recreation Agency	Funding for half of project costs through BOR.
Soil Conservation Service	Design, engineering, and inspection during construction (funding of SCS technical assistance to come from RC&D funds).

Oklahoma

Eleven substate planning districts blanket the State and have professional staff performing planning and development activities. ^{9/} Substate planning districts have been designated by various Federal and State agencies to perform planning and development activities. For example, EDA has assigned economic development responsibilities to various districts, HEW has assigned comprehensive health planning responsibilities, and HUD's Office of Community Affairs and Planning (OCAP) has assigned community development activities.

Districts cooperate with partner State and Federal agencies in accomplishing their objectives. For example, the OCC and the LEAA constitute State and Federal partners in criminal justice. The State Unit on Aging (SUOA) and HEW constitute State and Federal partners in services for the aging. The boundaries for all these activities are coterminous with the substate planning districts and all activities are carried out by the staff of the Substate Planning Office.

Three RC&D projects have been authorized for assistance from USDA: Cherokee Hills project; Quachita Mountains project; and the Association of

^{9/} For boundaries of the substate planning regions, and the RC&D's, see Status of Multicounty Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., June 1973.

South Central Oklahoma Governments project. Areas of the latter two projects are coterminous with Substate Planning Districts.

County Development Councils (CDC's) are an outgrowth of State, district, and county rural development committees. In many cases the CDC's are an integral component of district activity. They were created to provide a means through which interested citizens, organizations, and public agencies may work together to identify needs, set priorities, and establish study groups where none exist. CDC's are organized in 72 of the 77 counties in Oklahoma.

Because of time limitations and the scope of activities performed by these agencies, it was impossible to summarize the activities of each for this study. However, two substate planning districts (2 and 7) were selected to illustrate their rural development activities and responsibilities. District 2 has had an active staff since 1967 and thus is well established in carrying out its responsibilities. District 7 has had an active staff since 1971 and is in the initiation stage for many programs. The following discussion includes information on legal status, governing body, and primary functions for each district.

Eastern Oklahoma Development District

Substate Planning District 2, or Eastern Oklahoma Development District (EODD), consists of seven counties in east-central Oklahoma: Adair, Cherokee, McIntosh, Muskogee, Okmulgee, Sequoyah, and Wagoner. In 1970, total population was 191,220. These seven counties were designated as an Economic Development District in 1967 and an office was established in Muskogee. In 1971, the Governor delineated this district and 10 others as Substate Planning Districts. EODD is coterminous with the Economic Development District. Three counties (Sequoyah, Adair, and Cherokee) in the district are also in RC&D project areas.

The primary functions of EODD are planning, clearinghouse responsibility, and technical assistance.

Planning--EODD is charged with carrying out planning activities in the district. During FY-73, EODD staff completed 11 regional plans and 1 community plan:

<u>Plan</u>	<u>Required by</u>
Base Studies	HUD-OCAP
Land Use Element	HUD-OCAP
Solid Waste Element	HUD-OCAP
Water and Sewer Element	HUD-OCAP
Housing and Relocation Element	HUD-OCAP
Storm Drainage and Flood Control Element	HUD-OCAP
Open Space Element	HUD-OCAP
Comprehensive Health Plan	HEW
Law Enforcement Plan	LEAA-OCC
Aging Plan	SUOA-HEW
Industrial Sites Survey	EDA
Stilwell Community Plan	HUD

The EODD staff prepared the above plans and is continually updating them--adding data, adding additional refinement--and implementing them. Regional goals and objectives were established by forming goals committees at the local level. County Development Councils assisted by scheduling training sessions for members of the goals committee. Public hearings were held to discuss problems, goals, and objectives of each local entity. As the goals program continues, the community, county, and EODD District goals that emerge will provide the foundation for community, county, district, and State plans and programs.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--EODD as a substate planning agency is designated as a regional clearinghouse for Federal and State programs and projects, as required by OMB Circular A-95.

EODD reviewed 171 applications in FY-73. Of these, 92 originated within the seven-county district and 79 were from outside. The following summarizes the applications.

Projects originating within district:

<u>County</u>	<u>Applications</u>	<u>Total costs of projects</u>	<u>Federal share</u>
	<u>Number</u>		<u>Dollars</u>
Adair	7	1,968,470	1,809,500
Cherokee	11	4,457,983	2,736,728
McIntosh	7	446,947	340,210
Muskogee	23	6,112,948	5,049,509
Okmulgee	10	2,464,730	1,848,226
Sequoyah	16	1,730,641	1,191,470
Wagoner	18	1,341,347	905,966
Total	92	18,523,066	13,881,639

Projects originating outside district:

<u>Program</u>	<u>Applications</u>	<u>Total Costs</u>
	<u>Number</u>	<u>Dollars</u>
Law Enforcement	46	26,392,476
Open Space	1	18,000,000
Health	15	1,981,408
Planning	13	3,115,836
Community Action	2	183,314
Technical		
Assistance	1	2,500
Other	1	289,300
Total	79	49,964,843

The total cost, Federal share, and local matching funds for all programs were as follows:

<u>Total cost</u>	<u>Federal share</u>	<u>Local funds</u>
- - - - - <u>Dollars</u> - - - - -		
18,523,066	13,881,639	4,641,427
<u>49,964,843</u>	<u>38,241,935</u>	<u>11,722,908</u>
68,487,909	52,123,574	16,364,335

Ten projects were recommended for disapproval by the board during FY-73. One housing program was recommended for disapproval because part of the area was in a flood plain. The remaining rejections were mainly law enforcement projects which involved duplication of effort, and the program was not consistent with the State plan or LEAA-OCC procedures.

To illustrate the procedure involved in the clearinghouse review, two projects are briefly discussed below. The Adair County Health Center project originated in the district. The State Water Pollution Control Plan originated outside the district.

(1) The Adair County Health Center project involved construction of a County Health Center in Adair County at a cost of \$400,000. The project leaders requested \$320,000 from EDA. Local matching money made up the difference. The application form was submitted to the EODD office in July 1972. The EODD office had 30 days in which to act. The office immediately sent copies of the application to the EODD review committee (9 members), the Adair County Development Council, the Adair County Health Department, the 21-member Eastern Oklahoma Health Planning Council to the Federal Extension district representation, and to 5 local government entities in Adair County. Thus, 38 entities or individuals were contacted for comment on the project. Within 30 days, comments were received and the application and comments were presented to the EODD board. The board adopted a resolution stating they recommended approval for funding by EDA. The application was then sent to the State for review and, upon clearance, was forwarded to EDA headquarters.

(2) State Water Pollution Control Plan originated at the State level. The program requested \$434,552 from the EPA, with \$352,835 in matching State funds. The clearance procedure began for the EODD staff on July 10, 1973, when they received the plan application. At this time, it was logged in and EODD had 30 days in which to respond. EODD personnel sent notification of this project within the district to the EODD review committee (31 individuals), 7 County Development Councils, 7 County Health Departments, the extension area specialist, 52 member entities, and 6 interested individuals. In total, 104 entities or individuals received notification. A public hearing was held on July 24. Several amendments were added to the plan at the hearings and EODD was granted an extension of time for clearance review. By August 30, the comments from entities and individuals had been received. The application and comments were presented to the board on August 30. The board passed a

resolution recommending that EPA approve the project subject to a number of revisions. The plan was to be revised according to suggestions, and submitted to EPA for action.

Technical Assistance--In addition to the planning function and clearing-house responsibilities, EODD's staff provides technical assistance in whatever capacity they can. In many cases they seek additional technical assistance from other agencies which have expertise in the problem area. Some such agencies are the Southwest Federal Regional Council, OCAP, State Health Department, Water Resource Board, Pollution Control Agency, OCC, Rural Development Committee member agencies, and Manpower. The EODD staff assistance included such things as project application assistance, drafting, surveys, and education programs.

Two projects, an industrial park for Muskogee and a community plan for Stilwell, are examples of EODD technical assistance to member entities.

(1) Muskogee Industrial Park. In May, 1972, the Greater Muskogee Development Corporation, an arm of the Muskogee Chamber of Commerce, asked EODD to specify possible funding sources for a 420-acre industrial park. The EODD staff identified EDA as a possible funding source and began completing a pre-application form and background work. Included as background work were an environmental assessment study, engineering study, economic impact study, and community interest. The preapplication report requested \$1.3 million for the industrial site.

Next, a preapplication conference was held with EDA officials in Austin, Tex. Attending the conference were a member of the EODD staff, and Officers of the Greater Muskogee Development Corporation and their engineer. The conference included a discussion of all aspects of the project. After the conference, EDA officials encouraged the Greater Muskogee Development Corporation to submit a formal application. It was submitted July 31, 1972. A-95 clearance procedures also initiated on that date were completed in 30 days. Between July and submission of the project, the size of the industrial park was reduced to 200 acres and requested funding was reduced to \$850,000. This project was approved by the board and the application was sent to the EDA Regional Office in Austin, Tex., which approved the project and forwarded it to Washington.

(2) Stilwell Community Plan. This project originated from monies made available by the Oklahoma Community Affairs and Planning Office for preparation of a community plan for several communities within the State. EODD's board established a priority rating to determine which community would receive the technical assistance. Stilwell was selected, and the local officials were notified. EODD's staff met with the Stilwell City Council and other interested groups to explain assistance available and to determine Stilwell's planning needs. A contract was negotiated which specified EODD's role in preparing the community plan, and EODD's staff began preparing it. Local input was obtained by meeting with the city council and a number of other local organizations. Special technical assistance was secured from a number of State and local agencies. The community plan was completed and presented to the city council. Since then, the EODD staff has continuously followed through, keeping the plan current and assisting in its implementation.

Northern Oklahoma Development Association

Substate Planning District No. 7, or Northern Oklahoma Development Association (NODA), consists of eight counties in north-central Oklahoma: Alfalfa, Blaine, Garfield, Grant, Kay, Kingfisher, Major, and Noble. In 1970 these counties had a total population of 161,187. In June 1971 they were designated as a Substate Planning District by the Governor, and an office was established at Enid in October 1971. NODA was the last substate Planning District to organize in Oklahoma.

The primary functions of NODA are classified into three groups for discussion purposes: planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance.

Planning--NODA is charged with statutory areawide planning. The NODA staff completed eight plans in FY-73. Five are elements of the comprehensive district plan--land use, water and sewer, housing, open space, and solid waste. The other three are community plans.

The NODA staff prepared the above plans and continually updates them. NODA obtains citizen involvement through a number of advisory committees on minority affairs, economic and rural development, environment conservation, housing and relocation, and water. Inputs from the committees will be used in establishing goals and formulating community, county, and district plans and programs.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--NODA is a substate planning agency and is also designated as a regional clearinghouse for Federal and State programs and projects. During FY-73, NODA reviewed 124 applications for funding and 20 applications for project extension. Of these applications, 45 originated from the district and 59 originated from the State. The projects are summarized below. Table 6 shows distribution of the funds.

	<u>Number</u>
Total reviews:	124
For extension	20
For funding	104
Source of application:	
Areawide	45
State	59
	<u>Dollars</u>
Total government funds applied for:	18,296,102
Areawide	3,328,330
State	14,639,442

Table 6--Summary of grant distribution, Northern Oklahoma
Development Association, FY-73

Funding service	:	Areawide projects	:	State projects
	:		:	
	:	<u>Number</u>	<u>Dollars</u>	<u>Number</u> <u>Dollars</u>
LEAA	:	24	282,937	43 11,107,480
HUD	:	1	29,000	6 1,978,594
EPA	:	7	999,871	2 350,000
HEW	:	1	10,000	0 0
BOR	:	3	43,824	3 147,368
Dept. of Interior	:	2	2,000	1 20,000
FAA	:	1	9,150	0 0
DOT	:	3	1,706,600	1 747,000
OEO	:	1	244,948	0 0
National Science	:			
Foundation	:	0	0	2 114,000
National Park	:			
Service	:	0	0	1 175,000
	:			
Total	:		3,328,330	14,639,442

Clearinghouse procedure for a project originating within the region is discussed below. The applicant was the Ponca City housing authority, which had requested \$3 million from HUD for a low-income housing project. The authority sent the preapplication notice and an environmental impact statement to NODA. The NODA staff immediately logged in the project and sent copies to the State clearinghouse, Ponca City, Kay County, County Commissioners, the Conservation District, and the State Health Department. The comments received on the preapplication form and the environmental impact statement were presented to the board members at their monthly meeting. The board voted to concur with the project without comment. The application, environmental impact statement, and comments were then forwarded to the applicant and the State clearinghouse.

A State Highway Department project illustrates a procedure for a project originating from the State. The project included an expansion and improvement of State Highway 64 in Alfalfa County. Upon receipt of the forms, NODA logged in the project and sent copies to Alfalfa County Commissioners, Soil and Water Conservation District Supervisors, and all communities on the route. Everyone except the city of Cherokee concurred on the project. Cherokee officials said the proposal might be inconsistent with their plans, such as drainage, water, and sewer. Upon receipt of Cherokee's comments, NODA set up a conference between Cherokee's city officials and the State Highway Department. After the project was thoroughly explained by the Department of Highways, the city officials realized it was really not inconsistent with their plans. They then

changed their stand and turned in a report indicating they concurred with the project. The NODA board, at its monthly meeting, reviewed all comments and voted to concur on the project. The forms then went to the State Highway Department and the project was advanced.

The NODA office failed to concur on three projects in FY-73. In most cases, problems arose because of duplication of efforts.

Technical Assistance--In addition to the planning functions and clearing-house responsibilities, NODA's staff provides technical assistance in whatever capacity it can. Major endeavors are summarized below and two specific examples illustrate NODA's involvement.

The NODA staff provides technical assistance in a number of ways.

- (1) The office sends out special letters to government entities as needed. For example, NODA's Executive Director wrote a letter to the elected officials of the communities in the district, explaining the forms associated with Federal revenue-sharing money. Many officials were confused by forms on how to spend the money, and how to record their expenditures.
- (2) As a result of these special letters, many community leaders call and ask NODA for assistance in completing forms, regardless of the project.
- (3) The NODA staff held county "how to" workshops on revenue sharing, involving 152 local elected officials. For another example, State statutes have outlawed open burning of waste by 1974 and many communities need to change their method of solid waste management. The NODA staff held a daylong seminar informing local leaders in the district of the requirements and alternatives facing them and held numerous countywide meetings related to solid waste management. Other seminars related to revenue sharing, zoning, and ordinance and subdivision regulations were held for local officials.
- (4) The NODA staff also assists members with many community service-type projects. Technical assistance includes such activities as completing forms, planning, budgeting, organizing, and evaluating alternatives. Some examples of projects are solid waste, sewer, water, health, zoning, and police protection.

Two examples illustrate the technical assistance offered by NODA. One relates to a sewer disposal system in Garber that was not meeting minimum requirements. The mayor asked the NODA director to talk before the Lions Club concerning the district office's role and the assistance it could give. Several weeks later the city council asked for NODA assistance. During a meeting with the city council, the problem was discussed and solutions were sought. Some topics discussed were how to obtain a consulting engineer, and where to obtain financial assistance. The city council selected an engineer. NODA provided a data base needed for proper planning of the sewer system. Also, NODA informed

the city council of available funding, procedures for making application (conforming with environmental assessment requirements), and the process of regional and State clearinghouse review.

The city applied to EPA for funding. The grant would pay 75 percent of the cost; local matching funds were available for the other 25 percent. The application was first sent to NODA, which reviewed the application and solicited comments from other interested agencies, including the county government, county health department, SCS, and State Health Department. Also public hearings were held and citizens' comments were placed on record. A professional from NODA served as an expert witness at the public hearings. His statements explained the technical situation of the existing treatment plant and environment assessments relating to the plant, and answered questions concerning the proposed funding of the proposed plant. NODA, after soliciting comments and approving the proposal, moved the application through appropriate clearinghouse channels. EPA advanced the project, and Garber expects to receive funds to construct a treatment plant that will meet the appropriate health standards. NODA was very helpful; it not only acted as the clearinghouse, but offered a considerable amount of technical assistance, particularly in explaining and unraveling red tape.

The solid waste disposal system problem in Grant County arose from the Oklahoma Solid Waste Act of 1970. Mayors and city council members contacted NODA for assistance in organizing a countywide solid waste system. The local officials sought assistance for funding sources and operation procedures. During the process of seeking a solution to the problem, a local individual indicated he wanted to set up a private firm to handle the county's solid waste. Since the community leaders and private individual were approaching this problem for the first time, they continued to seek the technical assistance from NODA. The State Health Department and SCS were consulted as to alternative sites that would meet the regulations. A site was selected that would minimize cost as well as meet requirements. After site selection, NODA assisted in developing budgets for estimating costs and revenue of a proposed system. The information was very useful in determining service charges. Also, NODA assisted the private individual in obtaining a small business loan. The countywide waste disposal system using the private contracts is now in operation.

Oregon

Three types of multicounty districts are found in Oregon: (1) Councils of Governments (COG); (2) Economic Development Districts (EDD); and (3) Resource Conservation and Development projects (RC&D). ^{10/} One other type, the Substate Planning and Development Administration District, is frequently referred to in this report. Fourteen COG's blanket the State; 13 are functional, with staff hired to carry out their responsibilities. There are five EDD's in Oregon. Four have professional staff which are independent of the COG's. The

^{10/} For the boundaries of the COGs, the EDDs, and the RC&Ds, see Status of Multicounty Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., July 1973.

boundaries of two EDD's are coterminous with the corresponding COG's. Three RC&D's have been organized and are operational. Another has submitted an application. The boundaries of the current RC&D's are not coterminous with the COG's.

For a more detailed description of the responsibilities and activities of multicounty rural development activities in Oregon, a COG and an RC&D project were selected. These are the East Central Oregon Association of Counties (ECOAC) and the Upper Willamette Resource Conservation and Development project.

East Central Oregon Association of Counties

The ECOAC consists of four counties: Grant, Morrow, Umatilla, and Wheeler, with a total population of about 60,000. ECOAC, formally organized in August 1971, is referred to in this report as COG-M.

COG-M has the same staff as the Substate Planning District 12. However, the Substate Planning District 12 also includes Gilliam County. The Columbia Blue Mountain RC&D is coterminous with Substate Planning District 12 but has a separate staff.

The COG functions basically to bring all units of government together to more efficiently carry out the activities relating to rural economic development and regional planning. Its primary functions are planning, clearinghouse responsibilities, and technical assistance.

Planning--The following planning activities were performed in FY-73.

(1) HUD Comprehensive Land Use Plan. This was developed on a districtwide basis. Such a plan was necessary so that a COG could be certified as a planning agency. About 5 man-months of effort went into this plan.

(2) Law Enforcement Statewide Planning. About 5 man-months were expended.

(3) Overall Economic Development Plan. This was required by EDA so the area could be designated as an EDD. Four man-months were spent on this plan.

(4) Alternate Use and Feasibility Study. Part of an Army depot located in the COG-M area was about to be designated as surplus. The Hermiston Development Corporation, a local concern, asked the COG to determine the best possible use for this surplus property. Because of limited manpower, the COG hired a consulting firm from Portland to make this study.

(5) HUD-Housing Study and proposed implementation plan was developed on a districtwide basis and required about 5 man-months.

Regional goals of the COG are really a product of local input. The COG tries to provide background material to help local decisionmakers arrive at the correct decisions and establish the proper priorities. The COG does not have a growth control policy stipulating where growth will occur. Rather, it is guided by regional goals, objectives, and projects as determined by the local people.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--The COG has A-95 clearinghouse responsibilities. This function can be time consuming; as many as 40 reviews are made monthly. Considerable time is also spent preparing background material before an A-95 Review form can be circulated.

To illustrate the time and procedure involved in a clearinghouse review, two examples are discussed below--a project requesting HUD "701" Comprehensive Planning Assistance and an EDA planning grant.

Much preliminary work is needed before a project enters the A-95 process. A project may begin as an idea of some individual, who submits an A-95 form to the State clearinghouse in Salem. This office sends forms to a district clearinghouse, which in turn submits them to any interested government agencies in COG-M. These agencies review the A-95 forms and return them to the State clearinghouse. They then go back to COG-M. The State reviews the forms and sends this review, plus all of the other agencies reviews, to HUD for its action.

Virtually the same procedure was followed in another example concerning EDA planning, but this plan was also reviewed by the Columbia Blue Mountain RC&D and the District 12 Rural Development Committee, which is an advisory committee to the COG-M board on rural development matters.

An adverse comment on one A-95 review brought up the possibility of a duplication of government funds. The problem was resolved by the agencies concerned.

Technical Assistance--The COG is also involved in activities not of a planning or technical nature. It assists various agencies in preparing applications for grants, handles transfers of Federal grant funds, provides general information to the public on sewer and water problems, and works with law enforcement agencies in studying the needs for better detention facilities and improved police radio systems.

The COG is limited in this type of assistance by the lack of a good library. There is no local technical research library service and hence the COG must contact either the Extension Service or Portland State University for help in researching various problems.

Personnel also contact various Federal, State, and local agencies as the need arises. They expressed a real need for information on the availability of dollars for project funding.

The COG performs considerable technical work on demand. A case in point is the request by Wheeler County for assistance in filling out forms to apply for Federal Hill-Burton funds for a 90 percent grant for construction of a local medical facility. The COG Physical Planner met with the administrator of the Hill-Burton funds, assembled supporting data, got the proper signatures on the grant application, and sent the forms to the Hill-Burton administrator. Follow-up work included acquiring more data and attending a hearing in Salem regarding the application. The application was approved and the medical facility will be established in Wheeler County.

Another example of technical assistance by the COG was mentioned earlier. A local development corporation requested assistance from the COG in determining alternative uses for a potentially surplus portion of an Army depot. The COG applied to the EDA regional office in Seattle for technical assistance funds to make the study. This request was granted. Because of personnel limitations, the COG advertised for consultants to bid on this study proposal. The contract was awarded and the service performed. The consultant will submit its report to COG, which will in turn forward it to the local development corporation which initiated the request.

Other Activities--COG does not do any basic research because of manpower limitations, although it performs some economic analysis on specific projects.

The COG does very little that would be classed as action programs and projects, but does handle transfer funds which go to action groups. It does not sponsor workshops, seminars, or similar activities. As time and resources allow, it cooperates with other multicounty districts such as the RC&D.

Upper Willamette Resource Conservation and Development Project

The Upper Willamette RC&D project is located in the upper part of the Willamette Valley and adjacent coastal areas of Oregon. Four counties--Benton, Lane, Lincoln, and Linn, containing about one-third of a million people--make up this RC&D. Lincoln County and the western portion of Lane County are coastal; the remaining area is interior valley.

The RC&D was organized in 1964 following the Food and Agricultural Act of 1962 (P.L. 87-703), which brought the concept of RC&D into being.

The original project boundaries were the Upper Willamette River basin watershed. This included a small part of Benton County, the southern fringe of Linn County, the eastern portion of Lane County, plus a very small part of Douglas County. In 1965 the project boundaries were expanded to include the remainder of Linn County and the Mary's River drainage area of Benton County. The remainder of the Willamette Valley portion of Benton County was added in 1968. In 1970, all of Lincoln County and the remainder of Benton and Lane counties were added. No further expansion of this RC&D is anticipated as the area is now consistent with the COG.

All of the RC&D programs and projects are designed to coordinate and accelerate the resource development of the area.

Projects and Assistance--The RC&D does not have a policy indicating where growth should occur. All projects are carried out at the request of the sponsors. Sponsors and concerned citizens may emphasize certain areas more than others. Regional goals are the combined effort of all the sponsors, individuals, or groups who interact and supply the governing board with ideas, suggestions, and recommendations.

An example of a project undertaken by the Upper Willamette staff is the Periwinkle Flood Prevention and Recreation measure. A group of landowners in the Periwinkle area requested assistance in solving their flood problems

through the East Linn Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD). The SWCD Board referred the request to the RC&D governing board. Since Periwinkle is within the city of Albany and the Grand Prairie Water Control District, the group of landowners asked the city and district to accept legal responsibility for the measure. The city of Albany asked the RC&D sponsors to amend the original request for assistance on flood prevention to include recreation, and a plan was developed. The floodway was utilized to provide space for bicycle and foot paths between two parks with fishing ponds. Nearly 1 man-year of time was spent by the RC&D in preparing the plan. A Project Agreement has been signed by the city of Albany and the SCS, and monies have been set aside for construction of the first phase of this measure.

All efforts of the RC&D are not directed toward planning and implementation of project measures. Considerable time is expended by lay people, with assistance from cooperating agencies, in preparing reports and compiling data on a wide variety of subjects. For example:

- Preparing the North Albany Flood Plain Study
- Listing priority areas for flood plain information studies
- Preparing soil interpretive reports for municipalities
- Locating the historic Applegate Trail in the project area
- Coordinating the development of the Triangle Lake Nature Trail
- Cooperating with agencies on methods of utilizing grass seed straw
- Controlling predatory animals
- Analyzing dam site location
- Sponsoring an Area Beautification Contest
- Sponsoring workshops in flood plain management
- Preparing bark utilization studies
- Developing post-peeling operations
- Giving post-peeling demonstrations
- Studying feasibility of a river greenway

The RC&D governing board received requests from concerned people, agencies, and governments to initiate some of the above studies. Other studies were initiated by RC&D committees to meet their needs for various types of information. There is considerable need for research data which the RC&D and cooperating agencies can utilize.

The RC&D governing board draws heavily on various government agencies for assistance in carrying out its program of action. The particular agency or department contacted depends on the type of expertise needed by the RC&D. Agencies it utilizes include:

- U.S. Department of Agriculture (8 agencies)
- U.S. Department of Army
- U.S. Department of Commerce
- U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
- U.S. Department of the Interior (6 agencies)
- U.S. Small Business Administration
- State of Oregon (11 agencies)

Oregon State University
Council of Governments
City Planning Commission
City Councils

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--The RC&D does not have A-95 clearinghouse responsibility. However, it does have to submit its projects for clearance through this route, and it also assists local sponsors in preparing for the review and submitting basic data needed for the review.

The basic process followed is the same for nearly all projects. Agencies review only those project proposals that are within their field of expertise or interest. The Rowland Flood Prevention Project is an example of the process involved.

The RC&D staff assisted the sponsoring agency, in this case the Little Muddy Creek Water Control District, in completing the A-95 forms. These forms were then submitted to COG-4, SCS, and the State clearinghouse in Salem. The clearinghouse sent copies to interested State and Federal agencies, such as the State Department of Environmental Quality, State Game Commission, State Fish Commission, State Highway Department, EPA, and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Each agency reviewed the application and returned it to the clearinghouse with comments. Comments are generally limited to a statement regarding the project's effect on the environment. If an agency feels it would have an adverse effect they so state. The RC&D sponsor then meets with this reviewer and tries to reconcile the difference.

Technical Assistance--The Upper Willamette staff also provides technical assistance as expertise and time permit. The Little Muddy Creek Water Control District project and the North Albany Flood Plain are examples of the type of technical assistance provided by the RC&D technical staff. The staff helped the sponsoring organization, the Little Muddy Creek Water Control District, complete the A-95 forms. These forms were then submitted to the State clearinghouse in Salem, District 4 COG in Corvallis, and SCS. The State clearinghouse sent copies to interested State and Federal agencies such as the State Department of Environmental Quality, State Game Commission, State Fish Commission, State Highway Department, EPA, and the National Marine Fisheries Service. Each agency reviewed the application and returned it to the State clearinghouse with comments. Comments were generally limited to a statement regarding the effect of the project on the environment. If the agency felt it would have an adverse effect, it so stated. The RC&D measure sponsor then met jointly with the reviewer and the RC&D technical staff to reconcile any differences. The Rowland Measure was initiated by the Little Muddy Creek Water Control District. This special district requested technical assistance for flood prevention from the Linn Lane SWCD, which in turn asked for accelerated assistance from the RC&D sponsors. After a reconnaissance study, the RC&D sponsors reviewed the measure proposal and recommended that it be implemented. Planning of this measure by the RC&D technical staff was underway in FY-74.

Another example of technical assistance provided by the RC&D relates to the North Albany Flood Plain Project referred to earlier. In the North Albany area of Benton County, construction of residential housing was encroaching on some of the natural drainageways. The Benton County engineer, fearful of a potential flood problem, requested the local SWCD for help in identifying the flood plain and the floodways. The SWCD lacked the necessary resources and asked the RC&D sponsors for accelerated technical assistance. A report was prepared by the RC&D technical staff, using data provided by the Corps of Engineers and SCS. This report included maps that identified the soils, flood plains, and floodways. It has since been used as a guide by the Benton County Board of Commissioners in issuing building permits. About 600 man-hours were spent on this measure.

South Dakota

Three types of multicounty planning development organizations are active in South Dakota: Planning and Development Districts (P&DD's), organized under the State Model Rural Development Program; Councils of Governments (COG's); and RC&D Projects. ^{11/} The Governor's Executive Order of December 4, 1970, established the boundaries for six planning and development districts. Five were organized and in operation by November 1, 1973; the other one was organized later. One P&DD is organized as a COG. Part of one county in this COG is also included in an interstate COG. Two RC&D projects are operational. One P&DD was selected for detailed study.

First Planning and Development District

This district is located in the east-central part of South Dakota and consists of 10 counties: Brookings, Clark, Codington, Deuel, Grant, Hamlin, Kingsbury, Lake, Miner, and Moody. The 1970 population totaled 98,600 -- 38 percent urban, 29 percent rural-nonfarm, and 33 percent rural-farm. First P&DD was established in March 1971 by the State Planning Bureau as a pilot project under the State Model Rural Development Program. The present district organization came into being in July 1971, on approval of the Joint Cooperative Agreement by the boards of commissioners of all 10 counties. Watertown is the headquarters.

The district was designated as an Economic Development District (EDD) by EDA in May 1973. The District staff carries out the activities resulting from the EDD designation, with the same policymaking board offering advice.

The District I Criminal Justice Committee, which is funded by LEAA through the State Crime Commission, operates as a subcommittee of First P&DD, within the same geographic boundaries. Its staff is considered a part of the P&DD staff. The chairman of the Criminal Justice Committee is an ex officio member of the governing body of the P&DD.

^{11/} For the boundaries of P&DD's, COG's, and RC&D's, see Status of Multi-county Planning and Development Districts, Edward J. Smith, Jack Ben Rubin, Robert C. Peak, Econ. Res. Serv., U.S. Dept. Agr., Washington, D.C., June 1973.

The Inter-Lakes Community Action Program (CAP), funded by OEO, formerly operated within the same geographical boundaries as the P&DD, but with a separate policymaking board and staff. Its office was located in Madison. In late 1973, local CAP agencies in South Dakota were replaced by a statewide CAP agency, with headquarters in Pierre, the State capital. Madison was retained as a suboffice to service projects in the District.

The East Dakota Conservancy Sub-District has a separate board. It operates in the same general vicinity, although its boundaries are not entirely coterminous with those of First P&DD.

The South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service recently reorganized its administrative district boundaries to conform to P&DD boundaries. The USDA Regional Development Committee, composed primarily of representatives of FmHA, Agricultural Stabilization and Conservation Services, SCS, and Cooperative Extension Service, uses the same boundaries as the P&DD.

At present there are no COG's, comprehensive health planning districts, or RC&D projects within the region. However, an application has been submitted to USDA for an RC&D project, with the same district boundaries and the same 10 counties included among project sponsors. It has been suggested that if the project is approved, its staff might be housed with the P&DD staff to facilitate closer cooperation. The three primary functions of First P&DD are listed below:

Planning--State statutes require that each county develop a comprehensive plan. It has been the policy of the State Planning Bureau to channel all HUD "701" nonmetropolitan planning grants for counties and municipalities through the P&DD's. The District Planning and Development Committee (DPDC), the governing board, has assigned these local planning jobs to its own staff, rather than suggest to counties and municipalities that they contract with outside consultants.

During FY-73, comprehensive "701" plans were completed for six counties (Miner, Hamlin, Lake, Moody, Grant, and Codington). The P&DD staff compiled data, prepared maps, and drafted the reports. In addition, it spent considerable time with each local board, not only to go over the content of the comprehensive plan, but also to discuss possible ways for implementing the plan, such as preparing zoning ordinances. The assistant director estimated that at least 6 man-months were devoted to developing "701" plans during FY-73. The "701" plans for the other four counties had been prepared by outside consultants, and approved by the county planning commissions prior to FY-73.

Proposed county zoning ordinances were prepared by outside consultants for five of the counties; the P&DD staff prepared revised drafts for four of these counties and prepared the original draft for the other county.

The P&DD staff completed the updating of water and sewer plans for nine counties, under a contract with FmHA, and prepared the water and sewer plan (plus the update) for the other county. The water and sewer "update" reports have been combined with the "701" plans into a single document for each county. Total time required was about 6 man-months.

The staff developed an overall economic development plan to meet EDA requirements. Total time required was about 3 man-months.

The staff prepared a comprehensive district manpower plan, required by the District I Ancillary Manpower Planning Board. The plan is used in allocating some of the funds available under the Public Employment Program, authorized by the Emergency Employment Act of 1971. Total time required was about 1 man-month.

The P&DD staff prepared a districtwide law enforcement plan, working in cooperation with the P&DD Subcommittee on Criminal Justice, to be used in allocation of LEAA grants. Two man-months were needed to prepare this plan.

With the assistance of the South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service, the P&DD sponsored a series of five afternoon workshops on local planning and zoning and five evening workshops on environmental concerns and planning during the spring of 1973. These workshops were held at two locations--participants from the five northern counties met at Watertown and those from the five southern counties met at Madison.

Regional goals and objectives were mainly determined from the regional plans. This was particularly true in the case of the water and sewer "updates," comprehensive district manpower plan, criminal justice plan, and overall economic development program.

Regional goals were established by the DPDC, based in part on suggestions made by the staff and the subcommittees.

Citizen input is obtained from members of subcommittees. Some inputs and "feedback" also are obtained from citizen participation in workshops and other public meetings.

Clearinghouse Responsibilities--First P&DD was assigned clearinghouse responsibility on July 1, 1972. During FY-73, it was involved in clearinghouse responsibilities for 55 projects. These projects are summarized below by type and funding agency.

<u>Project type</u>	<u>Amount requested</u>
	<u>Dollars</u>
Water and sewer	2,906,417
Road	15,345,633
Recreation	302,945
Electric power distribution	51,100,000
Airport	367,787
Hospital	600,000
Corrections	132,750
Miscellaneous	386,240
Total	71,141,772

Funding agencyAmount requestedDollars

FmHA	1,960,000
DOT	15,713,420
EDA	1,546,417
BOR	302,945
REA	51,100,000
LEAA	132,750
OEO	135,000
HEW	251,240
Total	71,141,772

The nature of the project determines the agencies contacted in a clearinghouse review. The government unit that made the application is notified, as well as all State and Federal agencies, local governments, and special-purpose districts that might be interested.

Outright negative comments were filed by the DPDC on only one of the above projects--a family-planning project which was to have been funded by HEW. In this case, the DPDC felt there was no need for the project.

In another case involving a highway bridge over the outlet of a lake, the DPDC suggested that the bridge be combined with a water control structure being planned by a different State agency, and subsequently attempted to get the two agencies to combine their projects.

The First P&DD staff expressed a number of opinions regarding possible improvements in clearinghouse procedure. They suggested that more Federal programs undergo A-95 review. The fact that some State and Federal projects are handled by the State Planning Bureau, instead of being channeled through the district, creates some confusion. They also felt that the DPDC should be informed of the results of review process. (What changes in project design resulted from clearinghouse review? Has the funding agency backed down on its commitments? When will construction begin?) Because of the lack of feedback from the agencies concerned, members of the DPDC tend to regard their effort in the review process as ineffectual and useless.

Technical Assistance--Supplying technical assistance to local governments is one of the major functions of First P&DD. Technical assistance includes information on government programs, statistical data, professional advice, and assistance in drafting applications for Federal grants. A monthly newsletter, sent to all members, State legislators, and U.S. Senators and Congressmen from South Dakota, includes current information on State and Federal programs affecting local governments, actions taken by the DPDC, status of multijurisdictional projects, major activities of the staff, and the technical assistance supplied local government units. An annual summary (March 1972 to February 1973) of technical assistance provided the local governments in each county listed nearly 300 such projects. A few of the major staff activities are described below:

(1) Held workshops on Federal revenue sharing in 9 of the 10 counties in the spring of 1973 for county, city, town, and township officials. Some towns and townships requested additional help in preparing the necessary documents (Actual Use Reports and Planned Use Reports). As a result of this education work, only 14 of the 242 municipalities and townships in the entire district failed to receive their October 1973 revenue-sharing checks; and half of these were in the one county that did not request a workshop on revenue sharing.

(2) Assisted counties and municipalities in preparation of applications for LEAA grants for various types of projects, including county court library, juvenile delinquency program, regional correctional facility, local jails and lockups, facilities for boys club, drug abuse centers, countywide police force, and plans for a regional police teletype systems.

(3) Assisted counties and municipalities in applying for BOR grants for outdoor recreation projects.

(4) Provided counties, municipalities, and school districts with information on chemical dependency (drug abuse) and juvenile delinquency programs.

(5) Provided counties and municipalities with information on solid waste disposal, recycling, sanitary landfills, and antiburning regulations.

(6) Helped counties, municipalities, and the Santee Sioux Tribal Council apply for grants to assist them in hiring people with specialized training under the Federal Emergency Employment Program.

(7) Helped municipalities apply to EPA for waste-water discharge permits.

(8) Provided municipalities with information on Federal financing programs for water supply systems, sewage disposal systems, public housing, and industrial development.

Research and Action Programs--The staff of First P&DD indicated several areas where research was needed:

Transportation policy and regulation.

Industrial development.

Local governmental services, including alternative ways of supplying county services in rural and sparsely settled areas.

Ground-water geology and hydrology.

Limnology, especially the eutrophication of lakes and ways to retard it.

Education, especially school district reorganization and alternatives to busing in sparsely settled areas.

Three major action programs undertaken in recent years are discussed below.

(1) Pride. This project is a massive undertaking, initiated by First District with the assistance of the Chicago and Northwestern Railroad, South Dakota Cooperative Extension Service, several county agents, various youth groups, many local government officials, and civic clubs. Abandoned autos and farm machinery were located and permission was obtained from the owners to

remove these eye sores to central assembly points, where a car-crusher firm compressed them for shipment to Eastern steel mills. Since so much of the assembly job was handled by volunteers, the crusher was able to compress the bodies without charge, whereas previously the charges had been \$2 to \$5 per car, or more than the local governments felt they could pay. The project was so successful it was repeated in February 1974.

(2) Save the Prairie Lakes (from eutrophication). This project involved a number of programs. SCS District Conservationists prepared soil capability maps of each county, which could be used to denote areas where septic tanks, sewage lagoons, and sanitary landfills would be undesirable as far as lake viability is concerned. At the request of SCS the DPDC embarked on a lengthy effort to have local officials select the 10 top-priority lakes out of the 32 major lakes in the 10-county region, because USDA does not have sufficient funds to work in all lake basins at once. SCS District Conservationists and District Supervisors then developed detailed plans for the watersheds in which the top priority lakes are located. The goal of these plans is to greatly reduce siltation of lakes.

When it appeared that USDA's Rural Environmental Assistance Programs (REAP) would be discontinued, First P&DD and SCS conservationists combined forces to develop an application for a 10-county RC&D project, with boundaries coterminous with those of First P&DD. Because some of the counties had been included in applications for other RC&D projects, prior applications had to be amended.

The P&DD staff has been active in urging county commissioners to put revenue-sharing monies into soil conservation practices, especially to counties with high-priority lakes.

The staff has helped county and municipal planning commissions develop zoning regulations for lake protection. Where a lake lies in two counties, an effort is made to have both counties adopt uniform regulations.

The P&DD staff testified before State legislative committees regarding lakeshore controls. Such legislation was introduced in the 1974 session of the South Dakota Legislature, although it failed to be adopted.

(3) Target of Opportunity. This encompasses a group of related projects, mostly funded by HEW. One of these was the Human Needs Survey, in which a 6-percent sample of households in each of the 10 counties was interviewed. A lengthy questionnaire was used to obtain information on the use of existing services, need for services, and attitudes toward the community and its problems. First P&DD hired the Institute of Social Services for Rural-Urban Research and Planning of the South Dakota State University to construct the survey questionnaire, conduct the survey, process the data, and prepare a summary of the more important data. A "Provider's Survey" was conducted in late 1973 to see what resources were available. These resources will be matched to the needs indicated in the first survey in an effort to discover the geographic and functional areas in which needs are not being met. "Needs" data have been made available to various agencies to help them improve their programs. First P&DD plans to use these data in various ways, including preparation of applications for various kinds of grants.

A Youth Services System was developed in cooperation with the Denver office of HEW, the Inter-Lakes CAP, and several State agencies. It is funded with a HEW grant to First P&DD. Its main objectives are to lessen alienation of juveniles from society by providing more socially acceptable roles for them, reduce the impact of labeling children as juvenile delinquents, and provide alternatives to incarceration for juvenile offenders.

Another major project in Target of Opportunity is the Integrated Human Services, whose purpose is to establish a multipurpose social, rehabilitation, and protective service center for welfare clients. This project has involved First P&DD, several State agencies, and HEW, under the leadership of the South Dakota Department of Social Services. First P&DD cooperated by furnishing data and professional staff time.

GLOSSARY OF ORGANIZATIONS

BOR	Bureau of Outdoor Recreation, U.S. Department of the Interior
CAA	Community Action Agencies
CAP	Community Action Program
CDC	County Development Council
COG	Council of Governments
CRPDC	County Resource Planning and Development Committees
DOT	U.S. Department of Transportation
DPDC	District Planning and Development Committee
ECOAC	East Central Oregon Association of Counties
EDA	Economic Development Administration
EDD	Economic Development District
EEA	Emergency Employment Act, administered by U.S. Department of Labor
EODD	Eastern Oklahoma Development District
EPA	Environmental Protection Agency
ERS	Economic Research Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture
ES	Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture
FAA	Federal Aviation Administration
FmHA	Farmers Home Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture
HEW	U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare
HUD	U.S. Department of Housing and Urban Development
LEAA	U.S. Law Enforcement Assistance Administration
LEAC	Law Enforcement Assistance Council
LRO	Lead Regional Organization
NODA	Northern Oklahoma Development Association
OCAP	Office of Community Affairs and Planning
OCC	Oklahoma Crime Commission
OEDP	Overall Economic Development Plan
OEO	U.S. Office of Equal Opportunity
OMB	Office of Management and Budget
P&DD	Planning and Development Districts
PNRS	Project Notification and Review System
RDC	Rural Development Committees, organized by Extension Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture
RC&D	Resources Conservation and Development
REA	Rural Electrification Administration, U.S. Department of Agriculture
REAP	Rural Environmental Assistance Program, U.S. Department of Agriculture
RPA	Regional Planning Agencies
RPC	Regional Planning Commission
SCORPC	South Central Ozarks Regional Planning Commission
SCS	Soil Conservation Service, U.S. Department of Agriculture
SUOA	State Unit on Aging, Oklahoma
SWCD	Soil and Water Conservation District
VISTA	Volunteers in Service to America
WRC	Water Resources Council